

EMBEDDINGS OF DERIVED CATEGORIES OF BORNOLOGICAL MODULES

RALF MEYER

ABSTRACT. Let A be an algebra with a countable basis and let B be, say, a Fréchet algebra that contains A as a dense subalgebra. The embedding $A \rightarrow B$ induces a functor from the derived category of B -modules to the derived category of A -modules. In many important examples, it happens that this functor is fully faithful. We study this property in some detail, giving several equivalent conditions, examples, and applications.

To prepare for this, we explain carefully how to do homological algebra with modules over bornological algebras. We construct the derived category of bornological left A -modules and some standard derived functors, with special emphasis on the adjoint associativity between the tensor product and the internal Hom functor. We also discuss the category of essential modules over a non-unital algebra and its functoriality.

1. INTRODUCTION

We first consider a motivating example. Let $\mathbb{T}_\theta^2$ be the noncommutative 2-torus with parameter $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Functions on $\mathbb{T}_\theta^2$ have Fourier expansions of the form $\sum_{m,n \in \mathbb{Z}} a_{mn} U^m V^n$, where U and V are invertible and satisfy the relation

$$UV = \exp(2\pi i \theta) VU.$$

The algebra $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ of *polynomial functions* on $\mathbb{T}_\theta^2$ is defined by the requirement $a_{mn} \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}^2]$. The algebra $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ of *smooth functions* on $\mathbb{T}_\theta^2$ is defined by the condition $(a_{mn}) \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{Z}^2)$, that is, $a_{mn} = O(m+n+1)^{-k}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\theta = 0$, then $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ is the algebra of Laurent series, that is, polynomial functions on $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^2$, and $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ is isomorphic to the algebra of smooth functions on $\mathbb{T}^2$.

Alain Connes has computed the Hochschild and cyclic homology of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ in [3]. He uses a small free $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ -bimodule resolution of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$. Such a resolution is rather easy to find for the dense subalgebra $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$. The crucial point in Connes's computation is that the same type of complex still works for $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$. There are situations that are similar at first sight, but where such a resolution does not exist. For instance, there is no small free $\ell_1(\mathbb{Z})$ -bimodule resolution for the convolution algebra $\ell_1(\mathbb{Z})$, although there is an evident one for the dense subalgebra $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}]$. This is why the Hochschild homology of $\ell_1(\mathbb{Z})$ is so hard to compute.

The above example generalises as follows. Let $f: A \rightarrow B$ be a bounded unital homomorphism between two bornological unital algebras. If you are unfamiliar with bornologies, you may think of topological algebras here for the time being. Choose any resolution of A by free bornological A -bimodules,

$$\cdots \rightarrow P_3 \rightarrow P_2 \rightarrow P_1 \rightarrow P_0 \rightarrow A.$$

“Resolution” means that the chain complex above has a bounded contracting homotopy. Now we consider the chain complex $B \hat{\otimes}_A P_\bullet \hat{\otimes}_A B$, which can be equipped

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 46M18; Secondary 18A40, 18E30, 19D55, 46A17, 46M15.

This research was supported by the EU-Network *Quantum Spaces and Noncommutative Geometry* (Contract HPRN-CT-2002-00280) and the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (SFB 478).

with a canonical augmentation map $B \hat{\otimes}_A P_0 \hat{\otimes}_A B \rightarrow B$. Here $\hat{\otimes}_A$ denotes the A -balanced complete bornological tensor product, which is defined by the universal property that bounded linear maps $X \hat{\otimes}_A Y \rightarrow Z$ correspond to bounded bilinear maps $b: X \times Y \rightarrow Z$ that satisfy $b(xa, y) = b(x, ay)$.

The complex $B \hat{\otimes}_A P_\bullet \hat{\otimes}_A B$ is a good candidate for a free B -bimodule resolution of B . It is always a chain complex of free bornological B -bimodules. If it is a resolution of B as well, we call $f: A \rightarrow B$ *isocohomological*. This is what happens for the embedding of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ into $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ and makes the cyclic homology of $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ computable. I introduced this concept in the context of group convolution algebras in [18] to facilitate some rather technical computations of coinvariant spaces. Of course, the information that f is isocohomological is particularly useful if A has a rather small free bimodule resolution. Proving that a homomorphism is isocohomological is usually difficult and requires some geometric insight into the algebras at hand. This is particularly apparent in the following situation.

Let G be a finitely generated discrete group and let ℓ be a word length function on G . Let $\mathbb{C}[G]$ be the associated group algebra and let

$$(1) \quad \mathcal{S}(G) := \left\{ f: G \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \mid \sum_{g \in G} |f(g)|(\ell(g) + 1)^k < \infty \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

Then $\mathbb{C}[G]$ is an algebra with a countable basis and $\mathcal{S}(G)$ is a Fréchet algebra, containing $\mathbb{C}[G]$ as a dense subalgebra. The embedding $i: \mathbb{C}[G] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(G)$ is isocohomological if and only if the slightly simpler chain complex $\mathcal{S}(G) \hat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}[G]} P_\bullet \hat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{C}[G]} \mathbb{C}$ is a resolution of $\mathbb{C}$, where $\mathbb{C}$ is equipped with the trivial representation of G and $P_\bullet$ is a free $\mathbb{C}[G]$ -bimodule resolution of $\mathbb{C}[G]$. I show in [19] that the homotopy class of this chain complex only depends on the large scale geometry of G and construct a contracting homotopy in the case where G is a combable group in the sense of [4]. In this article, we will see that it is also contractible if G has polynomial growth. The proof reduces this assertion to an analogous one for nilpotent Lie groups, which can be checked using chain complexes of differential forms.

There are finitely generated groups for which the embedding $\mathbb{C}[G] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(G)$ is not isocohomological because of the following obstruction: a necessary condition for $\mathbb{C}[G] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(G)$ to be isocohomological is that the rational cohomology groups $H^n(G; \mathbb{Q})$ must be finite dimensional for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

The main goal of this article is to explore other properties of isocohomological homomorphisms. Put in a nutshell, if $f: A \rightarrow B$ is isocohomological, then all homological computations with B -modules can be reduced to homological computations with A -modules. There are three basic constructions for which we verify this statement: the left derived functor $\hat{\otimes}_B^{\mathbb{L}}$ of the balanced tensor product $(M, N) \mapsto M \hat{\otimes}_B N$, the right derived functor $\mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_B$ of the functor $(M, N) \mapsto \text{Hom}_B(M, N)$, and the derived category $\text{Der}(B)$ over the category of bornological B -modules.

It is important for us to use total derived functors instead of the satellite functors like $\text{Ext}_B^n(M, N)$ and $\text{Tor}_n^B(M, N)$ that are often called derived functors. The latter can be obtained from the total derived functors $\mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_B(M, N)$ and $M \hat{\otimes}_B^{\mathbb{L}} N$ by passing to homology. Thus statements about total derived functors imply statements about their satellite functors. However, the passage to homology forgets the bornology, which is an important part of the structure. For instance, the chain complex $B \hat{\otimes}_A P_\bullet \hat{\otimes}_A B$ is a realisation of $B \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} B$. The definition of an isocohomological homomorphism therefore amounts to the condition that the natural chain map $B \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} B \rightarrow B \hat{\otimes}_B^{\mathbb{L}} B \cong B$ should be a homotopy equivalence. This is more than a statement about $\text{Tor}_n^A(B, B)$.

We will see in Theorem 35 that various conditions involving $\hat{\otimes}_B^{\mathbb{L}}$, $\mathbb{R}\mathrm{Hom}_B$, and $\mathrm{Der}(B)$ are equivalent to f being isocohomological. For instance, f is isocohomological if and only if the functor $f^*: \mathrm{Der}(B) \rightarrow \mathrm{Der}(A)$ induced by f is fully faithful. It is possible to prove these equivalences by hand, playing around cleverly with free resolutions. However, the proof gets more transparent and much shorter if we use some of the more advanced tools of homological algebra. There are also other situations where this machinery is useful. Therefore, a great part of this article deals with the application of homological algebra to categories of bornological modules.

Before I explain how this works, I should discuss why I use bornologies instead of topologies. A bornology on a vector space is a collection of bounded subsets that satisfies certain axioms. Topological vector spaces always carry canonical bornologies. As long as we are only dealing with Fréchet spaces, bornological and topological analysis tend to be equivalent (see [16]). Already for the simplest possible non-Fréchet spaces like $\mathbb{C}[G]$ or $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$, working topologically creates several technical problems. These problems are artificial because they disappear when we treat these spaces bornologically. One of the reasons why homological algebra with bornological vector spaces is particularly nice is adjoint associativity: the complete bornological tensor product is left adjoint to the internal Hom-functor. In particular, there is a canonical bornology on a space of bounded linear maps. In contrast, on spaces of continuous linear maps, there are dozens of topologies, which are useful for certain purposes, but do not have good algebraic properties. The complete topological tensor product cannot have any right adjoint because it does not commute with direct sums.

Adjoint associativity allows us to get assertions about homology from assertions about cohomology (with coefficients). In contrast, in categories of topological vector spaces homology seems to carry more information than cohomology. More precisely, let $f: A \rightarrow B$ be a continuous unital homomorphism between two topological unital algebras. The homological statement $B \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} B \cong B$ implies easily that the induced functor $f^*: \mathrm{Der}(B) \rightarrow \mathrm{Der}(A)$ is fully faithful. However, the converse seems to be false. At least, I have no idea how to prove it in general.

Let $\mathrm{Mod}(A)$ be the category of bornological left modules over some bornological unital algebra A . This category is never Abelian. Jean-Pierre Schneiders and Fabienne Prosmans have promoted the notion of a quasi-Abelian category (see [25–27]). The category $\mathrm{Mod}(A)$ is indeed a quasi-Abelian category. However, there are only very few situations where the resulting derived functors and derived categories are useful. The reason is that we usually do not want any nontrivial homological algebra to happen for $A = \mathbb{C}$. Moreover, we want free modules to be projective. Therefore, we do *relative* homological algebra and only allow resolutions with a bounded linear section. This setup can be formalised easily: $\mathrm{Mod}(A)$ with the class of extensions with a bounded linear section is an exact category in the sense of Daniel Quillen. Abelian categories and quasi-Abelian categories are, of course, special cases of exact categories. Most constructions that work in Abelian categories still work for exact categories with very mild extra hypotheses. Therefore, we shall work in the framework of exact categories.

We let $\mathrm{Ho}(A)$ be the homotopy category of chain complexes over the category $\mathrm{Mod}(A)$. This is a triangulated category, and the exact complexes form a thick, triangulated subcategory $\mathrm{Exact}(A) \subseteq \mathrm{Ho}(A)$. This is true for almost any exact category by [22]. The derived category $\mathrm{Der}(A)$ is defined as the localisation of $\mathrm{Ho}(A)$ at $\mathrm{Exact}(A)$. The exact category $\mathrm{Mod}(A)$ has enough projectives and injectives, namely, the free modules $A \hat{\otimes} X$ and the cofree modules $\mathrm{Hom}(A, X)$. This yields a rather explicit description of $\mathrm{Der}(A)$ and derived functors. Another important feature of $\mathrm{Ho}(A)$ and $\mathrm{Der}(A)$ is that these categories are generated in some sense

by appropriate subcategories of $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ (see Propositions 6 and 10). This idea goes back to [1]. It is very useful to reduce assertions about chain complexes to assertions about modules.

There is a canonical bornology on the space $\mathrm{Hom}_A(M, N)$ of bounded A -module homomorphisms between two A -modules M and N . The functors Hom_A and $\hat{\otimes}_A$ satisfy important adjointness relations. The most general statement is that there is a natural isomorphism of bornological vector spaces

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{B,C}(M \hat{\otimes}_A N, X) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_{A,C}(N, \mathrm{Hom}_B(M, X))$$

if M is a B, A -bimodule, N is an A, C -bimodule, and X is a B, C -bimodule.

It is easy to extend the construction of $\mathrm{Hom}_A(M, N)$ and $M \hat{\otimes}_A N$ to the case where M and N are chain complexes instead of modules. Applying the resulting functors to projective and/or injective resolutions, we define the derived functors $\mathbb{R}\mathrm{Hom}_A(M, N)$ and $M \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} N$. These are triangulated functors

$$\mathbb{R}\mathrm{Hom}_A: \mathrm{Der}(A)^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathrm{Der}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Ho}, \quad \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}}: \mathrm{Der}(A^{\mathrm{op}}) \times \mathrm{Der}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Ho}.$$

Here $^{\mathrm{op}}$ denotes opposite categories and algebras. They satisfy the appropriate analogue of adjoint associativity.

It is frequently necessary in noncommutative geometry to consider certain non-unital algebras like $\mathcal{D}(G)$, the convolution algebra of smooth, compactly supported functions on a locally compact group G . Although non-unital, $\mathcal{D}(G)$ has approximate identities, and $\mathcal{D}(G)$ is projective both as a left and right module over itself. We call algebras with these two properties quasi-unital. A module over an algebra is called essential if the module action $A \hat{\otimes} M \rightarrow M$ is a bornological quotient map or, equivalently, $A \hat{\otimes}_A M \cong M$. We let $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ be the category of essential modules. The category $\mathbf{Mod}(\mathcal{D}(G))$ is of great interest because it is isomorphic to the category of smooth representations of G on bornological vector spaces by [17]. The case of $\mathcal{D}(G)$ is typical for general quasi-unital algebras: most arguments for the group case work in this generality.

Any quasi-unital algebra has a multiplier algebra $\mathcal{M}(A)$, and the category of essential modules over A embeds as a full subcategory in the category of unital $\mathcal{M}(A)$ -modules. This embedding also preserves projectives, so that we get a corresponding fully faithful embedding of derived categories $\mathrm{Der}(A) \subseteq \mathrm{Der}(\mathcal{M}(A))$. This is not an equivalence of categories because $\mathcal{M}(A)$ is not an essential module over A . Although it may seem tempting to work with unital $\mathcal{M}(A)$ -modules instead of essential A -modules, there are important reasons for not doing so (see Section 4.4).

We also discuss the functoriality of $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ and $\mathrm{Der}(A)$. A bounded homomorphism $f: A \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(B)$ allows us to view B as an A -bimodule. We call f *essential* or just a *morphism* if B is essential as an A -bimodule. If A and B are unital, this just means that $f(1_A) = 1_B$. A morphism is called *proper* if it is a bounded map from A into B . We use the notation $f: A \dashrightarrow B$ to denote a morphism from A to B . We write $f: A \rightarrow B$ if f is proper. To any morphism, we associate functors

$$f^*, f^!: \mathbf{Mod}(B) \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(A), \quad f_*, f_!: \mathbf{Mod}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(B).$$

The functor f_* is right adjoint to f^* and $f_!$ is left adjoint to $f^!$. If f is proper, then $f^* = f^!$. This is reminiscent of the adjointness properties between functors in sheaf theory that carry the same names. However, beyond this formal point there is no further relationship between these two situations.

For example, if H is a closed subgroup of a locally compact group G , then we get an associated morphism $i_H^G: \mathcal{D}(H) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(G)$. It is proper if and only if H is open in G . The functors $(i_H^G)^*: \mathbf{Mod}(G) \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(H)$, $(i_H^G)_*: \mathbf{Mod}(H) \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(G)$, and $(i_H^G)_!: \mathbf{Mod}(H) \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(G)$ correspond to restriction, induction, and compact

induction of representations, up to certain relative modular functions. There is no classical analogue of the functor $(i_H^G)^!$.

After introducing the above structure on module categories, we turn to the characterisation of isocohomological homomorphisms. We give several equivalent characterisations. The most attractive one may be that f is isocohomological if and only if $f^*: \text{Der}(B) \rightarrow \text{Der}(A)$ is fully faithful. The general machinery developed above makes it easy to prove the equivalence of these conditions.

Then we consider some classes of examples of isocohomological homomorphisms. First we consider group convolution algebras, then crossed products. Our results on crossed products contain results on noncommutative tori as special cases. In the group case, we first exhibit how our definitions are related to [19]. We explain how to treat weighted variants of the space $\mathcal{S}(G)$ for a discrete group G . I needed this generalisation in a rather simple special case in [18]. Then we show that the embedding $\mathbb{C}[G] \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(G)$ is isocohomological for discrete groups of polynomial growth. The proof reduces this to the special case where G is a cocompact lattice in a connected nilpotent Lie group $\bar{G}$. We use the de Rham complex of compactly supported differential forms on $\bar{G}$ as a free $\mathbb{C}[G]$ -module resolution of the trivial representation of G . The same argument shows that the embedding $\mathcal{D}(\bar{G}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\bar{G})$ is isocohomological. For a Lie group G , let $\mathcal{O}(G)$ be the algebra of functions on G whose derivatives decay faster than any exponential in the length function. Our argument also shows that the embedding $\mathcal{D}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(G)$ is isocohomological for a large class of G , including all semi-simple Lie groups. It seems likely that the Harish-Chandra-Schwartz algebras of semi-simple Lie groups and their p -adic analogues are also isocohomological. However, so far I could check this only for $\text{Sl}_2(\mathbb{Q}_p)$.

2. BORNOLOGICAL MODULES OVER UNITAL BORNOLOGICAL ALGEBRAS

Throughout this article, we may consider bornological algebras over the real or complex numbers. We usually suppose that we work over $\mathbb{C}$ in our notation. We write $X \in_O \mathfrak{C}$ to denote that X is an object of a category $\mathfrak{C}$.

2.1. Bornologies. We shall only meet complete convex bornological vector spaces in this article. Therefore, we drop these qualifiers from our notation and tacitly assume all bornologies to be complete and convex. We refer to [8, 9, 16, 26] for general results on bornological vector spaces.

A *bornology* on a vector space V is just a collection of *bounded* subsets. Convexity of the bornology means that any bounded subset is contained in an absolutely convex bounded subset. If $T \subseteq V$ is an absolutely convex bounded subset, we let V_T be its linear span. There is a unique seminorm on V_T whose unit ball is $T' := \bigcap_{\epsilon > 0} (1 + \epsilon)T$. We call T a *complete disk* in V if $T = T'$ and V_T is a Banach space. Completeness of the bornology means that any bounded subset is contained in a complete disk. The complete disks in V form a directed set and $T \mapsto V_T$ is an inductive system of Banach spaces with the additional property that the maps $V_S \rightarrow V_T$ for $S \leq T$ are injective. We have a natural isomorphism of bornological vector spaces $V \cong \varinjlim V_T$. A closer look at this construction reveals that the category of bornological vector spaces is equivalent to the category of inductive systems of Banach spaces with injective structure maps (see [26]). Analysis in bornological vector spaces is done by reduction to the Banach space case. For instance, a sequence converges in V if and only if it converges in V_T for some complete disk T .

We shall need the following examples of bornologies. Any vector space V can be written as a direct union of its finite dimensional subspaces. This gives rise to the *fine bornology* on V . The precompact subsets of a Fréchet space V form a bornology,

called the *precompact bornology* on V . We remark that “precompact” is synonymous to “totally bounded”; it is equivalent to “relatively compact” in complete spaces.

Let V and W be two bornological vector spaces. We write $\text{Hom}(V, W)$ for the space of bounded linear maps $V \rightarrow W$. A subset $S \subseteq \text{Hom}(V, W)$ is called *equi-bounded* if $S(T) \subseteq W$ is bounded for any bounded subset $T \subseteq V$. The equibounded subsets form a complete convex bornology on $\text{Hom}(V, W)$. The bornological vector space $\text{Hom}^{(n)}(V_1 \times \cdots \times V_n, W)$ of bounded n -linear maps $V_1 \times \cdots \times V_n \rightarrow W$ is defined similarly. It is easy to see that there is a bornological isomorphism

$$(2) \quad \text{Hom}\left(\bigoplus_i X_i, \prod_j Y_j\right) \cong \prod_{i,j} \text{Hom}(X_i, Y_j).$$

Moreover, composition is a bounded bilinear map

$$\circ: \text{Hom}(X, W) \times \text{Hom}(V, X) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(V, W), \quad (f, g) \mapsto f \circ g.$$

Thus $\text{End}(V) := \text{Hom}(V, V)$ is a bornological algebra.

The *projective (complete bornological) tensor product* $V \hat{\otimes} W$ is a (complete convex) bornological vector space with the universal property that bounded bilinear maps $V \times W \rightarrow X$ into complete convex bornological vector spaces correspond to bounded linear maps $V \hat{\otimes} W \rightarrow X$ (see [8]). There is a natural bornological isomorphism

$$\text{Hom}(V_1 \hat{\otimes} \cdots \hat{\otimes} V_n, W) \cong \text{Hom}^{(n)}(V_1 \times \cdots \times V_n, W).$$

Hence $\hat{\otimes}$ is commutative, associative, and satisfies $\mathbb{C} \hat{\otimes} V \cong V \hat{\otimes} \mathbb{C} \cong V$ for all V . There are natural *adjoint associativity* isomorphisms

$$(3) \quad \text{Hom}(V \hat{\otimes} W, X) \cong \text{Hom}(V, \text{Hom}(W, X)) \cong \text{Hom}(W, \text{Hom}(V, X))$$

because these spaces are all bornologically isomorphic to $\text{Hom}^{(2)}(V \times W, X)$. Equation (3) implies that $\hat{\otimes}$ commutes with direct limits. Especially,

$$(4) \quad \left(\bigoplus_i X_i\right) \hat{\otimes} \left(\bigoplus_j Y_j\right) \cong \bigoplus_{i,j} X_i \hat{\otimes} Y_j.$$

In categories of topological vector spaces, adjoint associativity fails. There are many useful topologies on spaces of continuous linear maps, but they do not have particularly good algebraic properties. In fact, the most canonical structure on a space of continuous linear maps is a bornology, namely, the equicontinuous bornology. The complete projective topological tensor product ([6]) cannot have a right or left adjoint functor because it does not commute with direct sums and it does not preserve kernels. Instead, it commutes with direct products and preserves cokernels.

2.2. Bornological algebras and modules. A *bornological algebra* is a bornological vector space together with a bounded associative multiplication $A \times A \rightarrow A$. A *bornological (unital) left A -module* is a bornological vector space M together with a bounded bilinear multiplication map $A \times M \rightarrow M$ satisfying the usual rules $a_1 \cdot (a_2 \cdot m) = (a_1 \cdot a_2) \cdot m$, $1 \cdot m = m$. By the universal property of the complete bornological tensor product, this data is equivalent to a bounded linear map $A \hat{\otimes} M \rightarrow M$ satisfying similar properties. By adjoint associativity (3), this is further equivalent to a bounded unital algebra homomorphism $A \rightarrow \text{End}(M)$. The latter description is, of course, not available for topological modules. We let $\text{Mod}(A)$ be the *category of bornological left A -modules*, whose objects are the bornological left A -modules and whose morphisms are the bounded A -module homomorphisms. In this section, we only consider unital algebras and modules. The important generalisation to essential modules over quasi-unital algebras is treated in Section 4.

Right modules are defined similarly using a homomorphism $A^{\text{op}} \rightarrow \text{End}(M)$, a bilinear map $M \times A \rightarrow M$, or a bilinear map $M \hat{\otimes} A \rightarrow M$. Here A^{op} is the opposite

algebra of A . Thus we write $\mathbf{Mod}(A^{\text{op}})$ for the category of right A -modules. The category of A, B -bimodules is denoted by $\mathbf{Mod}(A \hat{\otimes} B^{\text{op}})$. We write $\mathbf{Bor}$ for the category of bornological vector spaces. Thus $\mathbf{Bor} = \mathbf{Mod}(\mathbb{C})$.

Any morphism $f: M \rightarrow N$ in $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ has both a kernel and a cokernel. The kernel is simply the usual vector space kernel equipped with the subspace bornology. The cokernel is the quotient $N/\overline{f(M)}$, where the closure of $f(M)$ is the smallest subspace of N that contains $f(M)$ and has the property that any sequence in $\overline{f(M)}$ that converges in N has its limit point again in $\overline{f(M)}$. It is an important fact that this quotient is again a complete convex bornological vector space (see [9]). We also have canonical bornologies on direct sums and products. These fulfil the usual categorical requirements for coproducts and products. As a result, the category $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ is complete and cocomplete, that is, any diagram in $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ has both a direct and an inverse limit. It is also clear that $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ is an additive category.

2.3. Adjoint associativity. If $M, N \in {}_O \mathbf{Mod}(A)$, we let $\text{Hom}_A(M, N)$ be the space of bounded A -module homomorphisms with the equibounded bornology. Thus $\text{Hom}_A(M, N)$ is a bornological subspace of $\text{Hom}(M, N)$. If $M \in {}_O \mathbf{Mod}(A^{\text{op}})$, $N \in {}_O \mathbf{Mod}(A)$, we define the A -balanced projective tensor product $M \hat{\otimes}_A N$ as the cokernel of the bounded linear map

$$M \hat{\otimes}_A A \hat{\otimes} N \rightarrow M \hat{\otimes} N, \quad m \otimes a \otimes n \mapsto m \cdot a \otimes n - m \otimes a \cdot n.$$

That is, we divide by the closure of the range of this map. Thus $M \hat{\otimes}_A N$ is a complete convex bornological vector space.

Now let A, B, C be unital bornological algebras. If $M \in {}_O \mathbf{Mod}(A \hat{\otimes} B^{\text{op}})$ and $N \in {}_O \mathbf{Mod}(A \hat{\otimes} C^{\text{op}})$, then $\text{Hom}_A(M, N)$ carries a canonical B, C -bimodule structure by $b \cdot f \cdot c(m) := f(m \cdot b) \cdot c$ for all $b \in B, c \in C, m \in M, f \in \text{Hom}_A(M, N)$. Thus we get a bifunctor

$$\text{Hom}_A: \mathbf{Mod}(A \hat{\otimes} B^{\text{op}})^{\text{op}} \times \mathbf{Mod}(A \hat{\otimes} C^{\text{op}}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(B \hat{\otimes} C^{\text{op}}).$$

If $M \in {}_O \mathbf{Mod}(B \hat{\otimes} A^{\text{op}})$ and $N \in {}_O \mathbf{Mod}(A \hat{\otimes} C^{\text{op}})$, then $M \hat{\otimes}_A N$ carries a canonical B, C -bimodule structure by $b \cdot (m \otimes n) \cdot c := (b \cdot m) \otimes (n \cdot c)$ for all $b \in B, c \in C, m \in M, n \in N$. Thus we get a bifunctor

$$\hat{\otimes}_A: \mathbf{Mod}(B \hat{\otimes} A^{\text{op}}) \times \mathbf{Mod}(A \hat{\otimes} C^{\text{op}}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(B \hat{\otimes} C^{\text{op}}).$$

Adjoint associativity (5) generalises to natural bornological isomorphisms

$$(5) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{B, C}(M \hat{\otimes}_A N, X) &\cong \text{Hom}_{A, C}(N, \text{Hom}_B(M, X)) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{B, A}(M, \text{Hom}_C(N, X)) \end{aligned}$$

for $M \in {}_O \mathbf{Mod}(B \hat{\otimes} A^{\text{op}})$, $N \in {}_O \mathbf{Mod}(A \hat{\otimes} C^{\text{op}})$, $X \in {}_O \mathbf{Mod}(B \hat{\otimes} C^{\text{op}})$. The proof of (5) identifies all three spaces with the space of bounded bilinear maps $f: M \times N \rightarrow X$ that satisfy $f(b \cdot m \cdot a, n \cdot c) = b \cdot f(m, a \cdot n) \cdot c$ for all $b \in B, m \in M, a \in A, n \in N, c \in C$. Equations (2) and (4) imply

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_A\left(\bigoplus_i M_i, \prod_j N_j\right) &\cong \prod_{i, j} \text{Hom}_A(M_i, N_j), \\ \left(\bigoplus_i M_i\right) \hat{\otimes}_A \left(\bigoplus_j N_j\right) &\cong \bigoplus_{i, j} M_i \hat{\otimes}_A N_j. \end{aligned}$$

2.4. Exact category structure. In order to do homological algebra we need extensions. There is a maximal class of possible extensions in any additive category: a diagram $K \xrightarrow{i} E \xrightarrow{p} Q$ with $p \circ i = 0$ is called an *extension* if i is a kernel of p and p is a cokernel of i . In our case, this simply means that the maps $K \rightarrow i(K)$ and $E/i(K) \rightarrow Q$ are bornological isomorphisms with respect to the subspace bornology on $i(K)$ and the quotient bornology on $E/i(K)$. The notion of an *exact category*

formalises the properties that a class of extensions should have. One can show that $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ with the class of all extensions as defined above is an exact category. However, in most applications and, in particular, in this article, we use a much smaller class of extensions. An extension is called *linearly split* if there exists a bounded linear map $s: Q \rightarrow E$ such that $ps = \text{id}_Q$. Equivalently, the forgetful functor $\mathbf{Mod}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Bor}$ maps $K \rightarrow E \rightarrow Q$ to a direct sum extension in $\mathbf{Bor}$. We always choose this class of extensions in the following.

Proposition 1. *The additive category $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ with the class of linearly split extensions is an exact category in the sense of Daniel Quillen. Moreover, $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ is complete and cocomplete.*

Proof. It is straightforward to verify that $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ satisfies the axioms for an exact category in [11, 12]. Completeness and cocompleteness mean that there are arbitrary direct and inverse limits. This follows from the existence of kernels, cokernels, direct sums, and direct products. $\square$

Although trivial, Proposition 1 is important because many definitions and theorems that are familiar from Abelian categories still work in complete and cocomplete exact categories.

We use the following notation from [11]. The special extensions $K \xrightarrow{i} E \xrightarrow{p} Q$ that are part of the exact category structure are called *conflations*; the maps i in conflations are called *inflations*, the maps p in conflations are called *deflations*. In $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$, conflations are linearly split extensions, inflations are linearly split bornological embeddings, and deflations are linearly split bornological quotient maps.

Choosing a smaller class of extensions corresponds to doing *relative* homological algebra. In our case, we work relative to the forgetful functor $\mathbf{Mod}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Bor}$, that is, we do homological algebra relative to the pure analysis that occurs in the category $\mathbf{Bor}$. This explains why the bornology creates no problems in the following algebraic constructions.

2.5. Free and cofree modules. There is a natural isomorphism

$$(7) \quad \text{Hom}_A(A, M) \cong M, \quad f \mapsto f(1),$$

for any left or right bornological A -module M . Together with (5) this yields natural bornological isomorphisms

$$(8) \quad A \hat{\otimes}_A M \cong M,$$

$$(9) \quad N \hat{\otimes}_A A \cong N,$$

$$(10) \quad \text{Hom}_A(A \hat{\otimes} V, M) \cong \text{Hom}(V, M),$$

$$(11) \quad \text{Hom}_A(M, \text{Hom}(A, V)) \cong \text{Hom}(M, V)$$

for any $M \in {}_O \mathbf{Mod}(A)$, $N \in {}_O \mathbf{Mod}(A^{\text{op}})$, $V \in {}_O \mathbf{Bor}$. Of course, it is easy enough to prove (8)–(11) directly. We call modules of the form $A \hat{\otimes} V$ *free*, those of the form $\text{Hom}(A, V)$ *cofree*. Equations (10)–(11) mean that the constructions of free and cofree modules are left and right adjoints of the forgetful functor $\mathbf{Mod}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Bor}$.

Lemma 2. *Let $K \rightarrow E \rightarrow Q$ be a conflation in $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$, let F be a free module and C a cofree module. Then*

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_A(F, K) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_A(F, E) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_A(F, Q) \rightarrow 0,$$

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Hom}_A(Q, C) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_A(E, C) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_A(K, C) \rightarrow 0$$

are conflations in $\mathbf{Bor}$ and a fortiori exact sequences of vector spaces.

Proof. The assertion follows immediately from (10) and (11). $\square$

An object P of an exact category $\mathfrak{C}$ is called *projective* if the covariant functor $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(P, \sqcup)$ is exact on conflations, *injective* if the contravariant functor $\text{Hom}_{\mathfrak{C}}(\sqcup, I)$ is exact on conflations. Thus Lemma 2 implies that free modules are projective and cofree modules are injective in $\text{Mod}(A)$. We say that an exact category *has enough projectives* if any object X admits a deflation $P \rightarrow X$ with projective P . Dually, it *has enough injectives* if any object X admits an inflation $X \rightarrow I$ with injective I .

Proposition 3. *The exact category $\text{Mod}(A)$ has enough projectives and injectives.*

Proof. The map $A \hat{\otimes} M \xrightarrow{p} M$, $a \otimes m \mapsto a \cdot m$, is a deflation because it has the bounded linear section $m \mapsto 1 \otimes m$. Its source is free and hence projective by Lemma 2. Thus $\text{Mod}(A)$ has enough projectives. The map $M \xrightarrow{i} \text{Hom}(A, M)$, $i(m)(a) := a \cdot m$, is an inflation because it has the bounded linear section $f \mapsto f(1)$. Its range is cofree and hence injective by Lemma 2. $\square$

3. DERIVED CATEGORIES OF BORNOLOGICAL MODULES

3.1. Chain complexes of bornological modules. A chain complex over $\text{Mod}(A)$ is given by $M = (M_m, \delta_m^M)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$, where the M_m are bornological left A -modules and the boundary maps $\delta_m^M: M_m \rightarrow M_{m-1}$ are bounded left A -module homomorphisms satisfying $\delta_m^M \circ \delta_{m+1}^M = 0$ for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. We do not require chain complexes to be bounded below or above. This has the advantage that the category of chain complexes is still complete and cocomplete.

We can also extend the functors Hom_A and $\hat{\otimes}_A$ to the level of chain complexes. Let $M = (M_m, \delta_m^M)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $N = (N_m, \delta_m^N)_{m \in \mathbb{Z}}$ be two chain complexes over $\text{Mod}(A)$. Let

$$\text{Hom}_A(M, N)_n := \prod_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \text{Hom}_A(M_j, N_{n+j}).$$

Together with the boundary maps $\delta(f) = \delta^N \circ f + (-1)^{|f|} f \circ \delta^M$, where $|f|$ is the degree of f , this defines a chain complex of bornological vector spaces. Let M and N be chain complexes over $\text{Mod}(A^{\text{op}})$ and $\text{Mod}(A)$, respectively. Then

$$(M \hat{\otimes}_A N)_n := \bigoplus_{p+q=n} M_p \hat{\otimes}_A N_q$$

with boundary map $\delta = \delta^M \hat{\otimes}_A \text{id} \pm \text{id} \hat{\otimes}_A \delta^N$ with appropriate signs defines a chain complex $M \hat{\otimes}_A N$ over Bor . If M and N are chain complexes of bornological A, B -bimodules and A, C -bimodules, respectively, then $\text{Hom}_A(M, N)$ is a chain complex of bornological B, C -bimodules in a canonical way. If M and N are chain complexes of bornological B, A -bimodules and A, C -bimodules, respectively, then $M \hat{\otimes}_A N$ becomes a chain complex of bornological B, C -bimodules. There are natural isomorphisms of bornological chain complexes

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_{B,C}(M \hat{\otimes}_A N, X) &\cong \text{Hom}_{A,C}(N, \text{Hom}_B(M, X)) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_{B,A}(M, \text{Hom}_C(N, X)) \end{aligned}$$

if M , N , and X are chain complexes over $\text{Mod}(B \hat{\otimes} A^{\text{op}})$, $\text{Mod}(A \hat{\otimes} C^{\text{op}})$, and $\text{Mod}(B \hat{\otimes} C^{\text{op}})$, respectively. This follows easily from the corresponding assertion for modules in (5) and (6). Of course, (6) remains valid for chain complexes.

3.2. The homotopy category of chain complexes. We let $\text{Ho}(A)$ be the category whose objects are the chain complexes over $\text{Mod}(A)$ and whose morphisms are given by $\text{Ho}_A(M, N) := H_0(\text{Hom}_A(M, N))$. That is, $\text{Ho}_A(M, N)$ is the space of homotopy classes of chain maps, where chain maps and homotopies are required to be bounded and A -linear. This is the *homotopy category of chain complexes* over $\text{Mod}(A)$. The homotopy category $\text{Ho}(\mathfrak{C})$ can be constructed over any additive

category $\mathfrak{C}$. It is well-known that $\mathbf{Ho}(\mathfrak{C})$ is a triangulated category if $\mathfrak{C}$ is Abelian. In fact, the axioms of a triangulated category were introduced by Jean-Louis Verdier with the purpose of formalising some properties of $\mathbf{Ho}(\mathfrak{C})$ that are needed to construct derived categories. We briefly recall the definition of the translation automorphism and the class of exact triangles in $\mathbf{Ho}(\mathfrak{C})$.

The *translation automorphism* $\Sigma: \mathbf{Ho}(\mathfrak{C}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Ho}(\mathfrak{C})$ is defined by $(\Sigma M)_m := M_{m-1}$, $\delta_m^{\Sigma M} = -\delta_{m-1}^M$, and $(\Sigma f)_m = f_{m-1}$ for a chain map $f: M \rightarrow N$. The *mapping cone* $\text{cone}(f)$ of a chain map $f: M \rightarrow N$ is defined by $\text{cone}(f)_m := (N \oplus \Sigma M)_m$ with boundary map

$$\delta^{\text{cone}(f)} = \begin{pmatrix} \delta^N & f \\ 0 & \delta^{\Sigma M} \end{pmatrix}$$

By construction, it fits into an extension of chain complexes $N \rightarrow \text{cone}(f) \rightarrow \Sigma M$, which splits if we disregard the boundary map. The resulting sequence of maps

$$M \xrightarrow{f} N \rightarrow \text{cone}(f) \rightarrow \Sigma M$$

is called a *mapping cone triangle*. A morphism of triangles is a triple of maps (μ, ν, γ) giving rise to a commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} M & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & C & \longrightarrow & \Sigma M \\ \downarrow \mu & & \downarrow \nu & & \downarrow \gamma & & \downarrow \Sigma \mu \\ M' & \longrightarrow & N' & \longrightarrow & C' & \longrightarrow & \Sigma M' \end{array}$$

This morphism is an isomorphism if μ , ν , and γ are invertible. A triangle in $\mathbf{Ho}(\mathfrak{C})$ is called *exact* if it is isomorphic to a mapping cone triangle.

A triangulated category is an additive category together with a translation automorphism and a class of exact triangles satisfying some axioms (see [23, 28]). The axioms of a triangulated category were invented to hold if $\mathfrak{C}$ is an Abelian category. Since all the definitions above only need $\mathfrak{C}$ to be additive, it is not surprising that the axioms still hold if $\mathfrak{C}$ is just an additive category. This is routine to verify. A detailed account can be found in [24]. Readers with some background in operator algebra K-theory may also profit from reading the relevant sections in [20].

Proposition 4. *The category $\mathbf{Ho}(A)$ is a triangulated category in which every set of objects has a direct sum and a direct product.*

Proof. We have explained above why $\mathbf{Ho}(A)$ is a triangulated category. Direct sums and products are easy to get: simply construct them in each degree separately and check that this has the required universal property. $\square$

Let $F: \mathbf{Mod}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(B)$ be an additive functor, where B is another bornological unital algebra. Applying F to each entry of a chain complex, we get a functor $F: \mathbf{Ho}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Ho}(B)$. It is triangulated because it commutes with the translation automorphism and the mapping cone construction.

Let $\mathbf{Ho} := \mathbf{Ho}(\mathbf{Bor})$ be the homotopy category of bornological chain complexes. Recall that ${}^{\text{op}}$ denotes opposite categories and algebras.

Lemma 5. *The bifunctors*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_A: \mathbf{Ho}(A \hat{\otimes} B^{\text{op}})^{\text{op}} \times \mathbf{Ho}(A \hat{\otimes} C^{\text{op}}) &\rightarrow \mathbf{Ho}(B \hat{\otimes} C^{\text{op}}), \\ \hat{\otimes}_A: \mathbf{Ho}(B \hat{\otimes} A^{\text{op}}) \times \mathbf{Ho}(A \hat{\otimes} C^{\text{op}}) &\rightarrow \mathbf{Ho}(B \hat{\otimes} C^{\text{op}}) \end{aligned}$$

are triangulated functors in both variables and satisfy

$$\text{Hom}_A\left(\bigoplus_i M_i, \prod_j N_j\right) \cong \prod_{i,j} \text{Hom}_A(M_i, N_j), \quad \bigoplus_i M_i \hat{\otimes}_A \bigoplus_j N_j \cong \bigoplus_{i,j} M_i \hat{\otimes}_A N_j.$$

Proof. It is easy to see that $\mathrm{Hom}_A(M, N)$ and $M \hat{\otimes}_A N$ are functorial for bounded A -linear chain maps and homotopies in each variable. If we fix one variable, then the resulting one variable functor Hom_A or $\hat{\otimes}_A$ commutes with the translation automorphisms and the mapping cone construction. Therefore, it is triangulated. The last assertion is obvious. $\square$

The following result is inspired by ideas of Marcel Bökstedt and Amnon Neeman [1]. It allows us to reduce assertions about chain complexes to assertions about modules. As usual, we embed $\mathrm{Mod}(A) \subseteq \mathrm{Ho}(A)$ by sending a module to a chain complex concentrated in degree 0. This is a fully faithful embedding.

Proposition 6. *Let $\mathfrak{T} \subseteq \mathrm{Ho}(A)$ be a triangulated subcategory that contains $\mathrm{Mod}(A)$. If $\mathfrak{T}$ is closed under direct sums or under direct products, then $\mathfrak{T} = \mathrm{Ho}(A)$.*

We may say, therefore, that $\mathrm{Ho}(A)$ is generated and cogenerated by the subcategory $\mathrm{Mod}(A)$. More generally, if $\mathfrak{C}$ is any additive category, we may embed $\mathfrak{C} \rightarrow \mathrm{Ho}(\mathfrak{C})$ as above. Let $\mathfrak{T} \subseteq \mathrm{Ho}(\mathfrak{C})$ be a triangulated subcategory that contains $\mathfrak{C}$. The following proof still works in this more general situation. We get $\mathfrak{T} = \mathrm{Ho}(\mathfrak{C})$ if $\mathfrak{T}$ is closed under countable direct sums and $\mathfrak{C}$ has kernels and countable direct sums or, dually, if $\mathfrak{T}$ is closed under countable direct products and $\mathfrak{C}$ has quotients and countable direct products.

Proof. First we prove that $\mathfrak{T}$ contains all bounded chain complexes. We do this by induction on the length of the chain complex. Chain complexes of length 1 are all obtained by applying a power of the translation automorphism to a complex concentrated in degree 0. Hence $\mathfrak{T}$ contains all complexes of length 1. Consider some chain complex M of length n , say, $M_{m+n-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow M_m$. There is an exact triangle involving M , the truncated complex $M_{m+n-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow M_{m+1}$, and M_m viewed as a complex concentrated in degree m . The last two belong to $\mathfrak{T}$ by the induction hypothesis. Since $\mathfrak{T}$ is triangulated, M belongs to $\mathfrak{T}$ as well. Thus $\mathfrak{T}$ contains all bounded chain complexes.

It remains to extend this to unbounded chain complexes. Here we need the hypothesis on direct sums or products. Suppose first that $\mathfrak{T}$ is closed under direct sums. Let $M = (M_n, \delta_n)$ be a possibly unbounded chain complex in $\mathrm{Ho}(A)$. Truncating it, we obtain an inductive system of subcomplexes $(\mathcal{F}_n M)$ of the form

$$0 \rightarrow M_n \rightarrow M_{n-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow M_{-n+1} \rightarrow \ker \delta_{-n} \rightarrow 0.$$

Evidently, the original complex M is the direct limit of these subcomplexes. Even more, the map $\bigoplus \mathcal{F}_n M \rightarrow M$ has an evident bounded linear section. This implies that M is also equal to the *homotopy* direct limit of the inductive system $(\mathcal{F}_n M)$. That is, it fits into an exact triangle $\Sigma M \rightarrow \bigoplus \mathcal{F}_n M \rightarrow \bigoplus \mathcal{F}_n M \rightarrow M$. Since $\mathcal{F}_n M$ is bounded for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we already know $\mathcal{F}_n M \in \mathfrak{T}$. If $\mathfrak{T}$ is triangulated and closed under direct sums, we obtain $M \in \mathfrak{T}$ as well.

A dual argument works if $\mathfrak{T}$ is closed under products. Now we consider a projective system of quotient complexes $(\mathcal{F}^n M)$ of M of the form

$$0 \rightarrow \mathrm{coker} \delta_{n+1} \rightarrow M_{n-1} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow M_{-n} \rightarrow 0.$$

The original complex M is the inverse limit of these quotient complexes. Since the map $M \rightarrow \prod \mathcal{F}^n M$ has an evident bounded linear section, M is also a homotopy inverse limit of $(\mathcal{F}^n M)$. Now proceed as above. $\square$

3.3. Exact chain complexes. Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be an exact category, for instance, $\mathrm{Mod}(A)$. A chain complex (M, δ) over $\mathfrak{C}$ is *exact in degree m* if $\ker(\delta_m: M_m \rightarrow M_{m-1})$ exists and $\delta_{m+1}: M_{m+1} \rightarrow \ker \delta_m$ is a deflation (see [12]). Equivalently, $\ker \delta_m$ and $\ker \delta_{m+1}$ exist and $\ker \delta_{m+1} \xrightarrow{\subseteq} M_{m+1} \xrightarrow{\delta_{m+1}} \ker \delta_m$ is a conflation. A chain

complex is called *exact* if it is exact in degree m for all $m \in \mathbb{Z}$. A morphism $f: M \rightarrow N$ is called a *quasi-isomorphism* if its mapping cone is exact in the above sense. In the case of $\mathbf{Ho}(A)$, a chain complex of bornological left A -modules is *exact* in degree m if and only if there exists a bounded, linear, not necessarily A -linear map $\sigma: \ker \delta_m \rightarrow M_{m+1}$ with $\delta_{m+1}\sigma = \text{id}$. It is exact if and only if there is a bounded linear contracting homotopy. A chain map is a quasi-isomorphism if and only if the forgetful functor maps it to an isomorphism in $\mathbf{Ho}$.

Proposition 7. *The subcategory of exact chain complexes $\mathbf{Exact}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{Ho}(A)$ is a thick, triangulated subcategory that is closed under direct sums and products.*

Proof. This is proved in great generality in [22]. The only hypothesis needed for $\mathbf{Exact}(\mathfrak{C}) \subseteq \mathbf{Ho}(\mathfrak{C})$ to be thick and triangulated is that idempotent morphisms in $\mathfrak{C}$ should split, that is, have a kernel and a range object. The assertion about direct sums and products follows easily if the class of conflations is closed under direct sums and products. $\square$

We call $M \in {}_O \mathbf{Ho}(A)$ *projective* if $\mathbf{Ho}_A(M, N) \cong 0$ for all exact chain complexes N (see [12]). The projectives form a triangulated subcategory of $\mathbf{Ho}(A)$ that is closed under direct sums. A *projective approximation* of $M \in {}_O \mathbf{Ho}(A)$ is a quasi-isomorphism $f: P \rightarrow M$ with projective P .

Proposition 8. *Let $\mathfrak{C}$ be an exact category with split idempotents. Projective approximations in $\mathbf{Ho}(\mathfrak{C})$ are unique up to isomorphism if they exist. The subcategory $\mathfrak{T} \subseteq \mathbf{Ho}(\mathfrak{C})$ of objects that admit a projective approximation is triangulated, and the construction of projective approximations defines a triangulated functor $P: \mathfrak{T} \rightarrow \mathbf{Ho}(\mathfrak{C})$. The same assertions hold for injective approximations.*

Proof. This is well-known. See [20, Proposition 2.4] for a quick proof from the axioms of a triangulated category. There it is assumed that $\mathfrak{T} = \mathbf{Ho}(\mathfrak{C})$. It is easy to see that we still get the assertions above without this requirement. $\square$

Proposition 9. *The category $\mathbf{Ho}(A)$ has enough projectives and injectives.*

There are triangulated functors $P, I: \mathbf{Ho}(\mathfrak{C}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Ho}(\mathfrak{C})$ and natural transformations $P(M) \rightarrow M \rightarrow I(M)$ such that $P(M) \rightarrow M$ is a projective approximation and $M \rightarrow I(M)$ is an injective approximation for each $M \in {}_O \mathbf{Ho}(A)$. The projective approximation functor commutes with direct sums, the injective approximation functor commutes with direct products.

Proof. We only prove the existence of projective approximations. The injective case is similar. Let $\mathfrak{T} \subseteq \mathbf{Ho}(A)$ be the subcategory of objects that have a projective approximation. It is evidently closed under direct sums and under the translation automorphism, and it is triangulated by Proposition 8. Proposition 6 yields that $\mathfrak{T} = \mathbf{Ho}(A)$ once $\mathfrak{T}$ contains $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$. Therefore, it suffices to construct projective approximations for objects of $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$. Using that $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ has enough projectives (Proposition 3), we construct a “projective resolution” $P_\bullet \rightarrow M$ for any $M \in {}_O \mathbf{Mod}(A)$. Viewed as a chain map $P_\bullet \rightarrow M$, this is a quasi-isomorphism because it is a resolution. It is easy to see that a bounded below chain complex of projective modules is projective. It follows from Proposition 8 that the construction is functorial and defines a triangulated functor. It clearly commutes with direct sums. $\square$

3.4. The derived category. The derived category of $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ is defined as the localisation of $\mathbf{Ho}(A)$ at the subcategory $\mathbf{Exact}(A)$ of exact chain complexes. Since there are enough projectives and injectives, this localisation is easy to describe explicitly. It has the same objects as $\mathbf{Ho}(A)$ and morphisms

$$\mathbf{Der}_A(M, N) \cong \mathbf{Ho}_A(P(M), N) \cong \mathbf{Ho}_A(P(M), I(N)) \cong \mathbf{Ho}_A(M, I(N)).$$

Here P and I are the projective and injective approximation functors. The projective and injective approximation functors on $\mathbf{Ho}(A)$ descend to triangulated functors $P, I: \mathbf{Der}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Ho}(A)$. Their ranges are the subcategories of projectives and injectives, respectively. These subcategories of $\mathbf{Ho}(A)$ are equivalent to $\mathbf{Der}(A)$ as triangulated categories (see [20, Proposition 2.4]).

Proposition 10. *Let $\mathfrak{T} \subseteq \mathbf{Der}(A)$ be a triangulated subcategory. Then $\mathfrak{T} = \mathbf{Ho}(A)$ provided $\mathfrak{T}$ contains all free modules and is closed under direct sums or $\mathfrak{T}$ contains all cofree modules and is closed under direct products.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathfrak{T}$ contains free modules and is closed under direct sums. The other case is proved dually. As in the proof of Proposition 6, one shows that $\mathfrak{T}$ contains all bounded below chain complexes of free modules. The freeness of the entries of the chain complex is not affected by our truncations because we only have to truncate above. Hence $\mathfrak{T}$ contains a free resolution for any $M \in_O \mathbf{Mod}(A)$. Since this free resolution becomes isomorphic to M in $\mathbf{Der}(A)$, we get $\mathbf{Mod}(A) \subseteq \mathfrak{T}$. Now the assertion follows from Proposition 6. $\square$

Let $F: \mathbf{Ho}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Ho}(B)$ be a covariant or contravariant triangulated functor. We may get such functors by extending an additive functor $\mathbf{Mod}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(B)$. Applying F to projective or injective approximations, we get the left and right (total) derived functors of F , which are denoted $\mathbb{L}F$ and $\mathbb{R}F$. By convention, $\mathbb{L}F(M) := F \circ P(M)$ and $\mathbb{R}F(M) := F \circ I(M)$ if F is covariant, and $\mathbb{L}F(M) := F \circ I(M)$ and $\mathbb{R}F(M) := F \circ P(M)$ if F is contravariant. The natural maps $P(M) \rightarrow M \rightarrow I(M)$ induce natural transformations $\mathbb{L}F(M) \rightarrow F(M) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}F(M)$ in both cases. By construction, the functors $\mathbb{L}F$ and $\mathbb{R}F$ descend to triangulated functors $\mathbb{L}F, \mathbb{R}F: \mathbf{Der}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Ho}(B)$.

Proposition 11. *Let $F: \mathbf{Mod}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(B)$ be a functor that commutes with direct sums and preserves projectives. Then the extended functor $F: \mathbf{Ho}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Ho}(B)$ also preserves projectives.*

Let $F: \mathbf{Mod}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(B)$ be a functor that commutes with direct products and preserves injectives. Then the extended functor $F: \mathbf{Ho}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Ho}(B)$ also preserves injectives.

Proof. The subcategory of projectives $M \in_O \mathbf{Ho}(A)$ for which $F(M)$ is again projective is a triangulated subcategory closed under direct sums. By hypothesis, it contains all projective modules. As in the proof of Proposition 10, this implies that it contains all projective chain complexes. The proof for injectives is dual. $\square$

3.5. Derived adjoint associativity. We now derive the bifunctors $\mathbf{Hom}_A(M, N)$ and $M \hat{\otimes}_A N$ of Lemma 5.

Lemma 12. *For any $M, N \in_O \mathbf{Ho}(A)$, the natural maps*

$$\mathbf{Hom}_A(P(M), N) \rightarrow \mathbf{Hom}_A(P(M), I(N)) \leftarrow \mathbf{Hom}_A(M, I(N))$$

are chain homotopy equivalences, that is, isomorphisms in $\mathbf{Ho}$. Similarly,

$$P(M) \hat{\otimes}_A N \cong P(M) \hat{\otimes}_A P(N) \cong M \hat{\otimes}_A P(N)$$

in $\mathbf{Ho}$ for all $M \in_O \mathbf{Ho}(A^{\text{op}})$, $N \in_O \mathbf{Ho}(A)$.

Proof. We only prove that the map $\mathbf{Hom}_A(P(M), N) \rightarrow \mathbf{Hom}_A(P(M), I(N))$ is a chain homotopy equivalence. The other cases are similar. Let F be a free bornological left A -module and let $E \in_O \mathbf{Ho}(A)$ be exact. Then the chain complex $\mathbf{Hom}_A(F, E)$ has a bounded contracting homotopy by Lemma 2. An exact sequence argument shows that the map $\mathbf{Hom}_A(F, N) \rightarrow \mathbf{Hom}_A(F, I(N))$ is an isomorphism in $\mathbf{Ho}$ because the mapping cone of $N \rightarrow I(N)$ is exact and the functor $\mathbf{Hom}_A(F, \sqcup)$

is triangulated. Thus the assertion holds if M is a free module. Let $\mathfrak{T}$ be the class of objects M for which the assertion holds for all $N \in_O \mathbf{Ho}(A)$. Since our assertion only depends on $P(M)$, we may view this as a subcategory of $\mathbf{Der}(A)$. It is triangulated and closed under direct sums by the properties of P and $\mathbf{Hom}_A(\sqcup, N)$. Hence the assertion follows from Proposition 10 and the special case of free modules treated above. $\square$

Therefore, we may define covariant bifunctors

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R}\mathrm{Hom}_A: \mathbf{Der}(A \hat{\otimes} B^{\mathrm{op}})^{\mathrm{op}} \times \mathbf{Der}(A \hat{\otimes} C^{\mathrm{op}}) &\rightarrow \mathbf{Ho}(B \hat{\otimes} C^{\mathrm{op}}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Der}(B \hat{\otimes} C^{\mathrm{op}}), \\ \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}}: \mathbf{Der}(B \hat{\otimes} A^{\mathrm{op}}) \times \mathbf{Der}(A \hat{\otimes} C^{\mathrm{op}}) &\rightarrow \mathbf{Ho}(B \hat{\otimes} C^{\mathrm{op}}) \rightarrow \mathbf{Der}(B \hat{\otimes} C^{\mathrm{op}}) \end{aligned}$$

by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R}\mathrm{Hom}_A(M, N) &:= \mathrm{Hom}_A(P(M), N) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_A(P(M), I(N)) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_A(M, I(N)), \\ M \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} N &:= P(M) \hat{\otimes}_A N \cong P(M) \hat{\otimes}_A P(N) \cong M \hat{\otimes}_A P(N). \end{aligned}$$

They are triangulated in each variable and still satisfy the assertions about direct sums and products in Lemma 5. They also satisfy adjoint associativity, that is, there are natural isomorphisms (in $\mathbf{Ho}$)

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{B,C}(M \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} N, X) &\cong \mathbb{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{A,C}(N, \mathbb{R}\mathrm{Hom}_B(M, X)) \\ &\cong \mathbb{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{B,A}(M, \mathbb{R}\mathrm{Hom}_C(N, X)) \end{aligned}$$

for $M \in_O \mathbf{Der}(B \hat{\otimes} A^{\mathrm{op}})$, $N \in_O \mathbf{Der}(A \hat{\otimes} C^{\mathrm{op}})$, $X \in_O \mathbf{Der}(B \hat{\otimes} C^{\mathrm{op}})$. For the proof, rewrite these chain complexes as $\mathbb{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{B,C}(P(M) \hat{\otimes}_A P(N), X)$,

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{A,C}(P(N), \mathrm{Hom}_B(P(M), X)), \quad \mathrm{Hom}_{B,A}(P(M), \mathrm{Hom}_C(P(N), X))$$

with projective approximations $P(M) \rightarrow M$ and $P(N) \rightarrow N$ in $\mathbf{Ho}(B \hat{\otimes} A^{\mathrm{op}})$ and $\mathbf{Ho}(A \hat{\otimes} C^{\mathrm{op}})$, respectively. Thus (13) follows from (12) provided $P(M) \hat{\otimes}_A P(N) \in_O \mathbf{Ho}(B \hat{\otimes} C^{\mathrm{op}})$ is projective. This is evident for free modules and follows in general from a by now familiar abstract nonsense argument involving Proposition 10.

3.6. Extension theory. Compose the embedding $\mathbf{Mod}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Ho}(A)$ with the canonical functor $\mathbf{Ho}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Der}(A)$ to get a functor $\mathbf{Mod}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Der}(A)$. This functor is still fully faithful because $\mathbf{Der}_A(M, N) = \mathrm{Hom}_A(P(M), N) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_A(M, N)$ if N is a chain complex concentrated in degree 0. The spaces

$$\mathrm{Ext}_A^n(M, N) := \mathbf{Der}_A(M, \Sigma^n N)$$

are of special importance. They clearly vanish if $n < 0$. These extension groups retain all the well-known properties in the case of Abelian categories. Namely, if $K \rightarrowtail E \twoheadrightarrow Q$ is a conflation in $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$, then there are associated long exact sequences in Ext_A^n in both variables. There is an associative cup product

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Ext}_A^n(M, N) \times \mathrm{Ext}_A^m(L, M) &\xrightarrow{\cong} \mathbf{Der}_A(\Sigma^m M, \Sigma^{n+m} N) \times \mathbf{Der}_A(L, \Sigma^m M) \\ &\rightarrow \mathbf{Der}_A(L, \Sigma^{m+n} N) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathrm{Ext}_A^{m+n}(L, N) \end{aligned}$$

for all $L, M, N \in_O \mathbf{Mod}(A)$, $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$.

There is an alternative description of $\mathrm{Ext}_A^n(M, N)$ by equivalence classes of n -step conflations of M by N as in classical Yoneda theory. In particular, $\mathrm{Ext}_A^1(M, N)$ is the space of all isomorphism classes of conflations $N \rightarrowtail E \twoheadrightarrow M$, where isomorphism means that there is an isomorphism $E \cong E'$ that induces the identity maps on N and M . All this holds in any exact category with split idempotents. It is easy to prove for $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ because there are enough projectives and injectives.

4. QUASI-UNITAL ALGEBRAS AND ESSENTIAL MODULES

In this section we treat bornological algebras that do not necessarily possess a unit element. We let A^+ be the bornological algebra that we get by adjoining a new unit element to A . Thus $A^+ := A \oplus \mathbb{C} \cdot 1$ as a bornological vector space. If $A \rightarrow \text{End}(M)$ defines a (possibly non-unital) module over A , then the unique unital extension $A^+ \rightarrow \text{End}(M)$ defines a unital module over A^+ . As a result, the category of non-unital left bornological A -modules is isomorphic to $\text{Mod}(A^+)$. If we define Hom_A and $\hat{\otimes}_A$ in the obvious fashion, then $\text{Hom}_A(M, N) = \text{Hom}_{A^+}(M, N)$ and $M \hat{\otimes}_A N = M \hat{\otimes}_{A^+} N$. Hence all the constructions of the previous sections apply to categories of non-unital modules without any change. The only point where we have to be careful is that the free and cofree modules are now $A^+ \hat{\otimes} X$ and $\text{Hom}(A^+, X)$. In general, A is not projective as a left or right A -module.

It is often desirable to work with a subcategory of essential modules $\text{Mod}(A) \subseteq \text{Mod}(A^+)$. For instance, let G be a locally compact group and let $\mathcal{D}(G)$ be the convolution algebra of smooth, compactly supported functions on G . The category $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{D}(G))$ is identified in [17] with the category of smooth representations of G on bornological vector spaces. In this section, we describe in general under what assumptions on A a category of essential modules can be defined, and we discuss some constructions with essential modules. The main ideas for this are already contained in [17]. Then we introduce morphisms between quasi-unital algebras and study the functors on module categories and derived categories they induce.

4.1. Basic definitions.

Definition 13 ([17]). A bornological algebra A has an *approximate identity* if for any bounded subset $S \subseteq A$ there is a sequence (u_n) in A such that the sequences $u_n \cdot x$ and $x \cdot u_n$ converge to x uniformly for $x \in S$. This means that the sequences converge uniformly in the usual sense in the Banach space A_T for some complete bounded disk $T \subseteq A$ depending only on S .

Definition 14. A bornological algebra A is called *quasi-unital* if it has an approximate identity and if A is projective both as a left and a right A -module.

Projectivity means that there exist a bounded left A -module homomorphism $l: A \rightarrow A^+ \hat{\otimes} A$ and a bounded right A -module homomorphism $r: A \rightarrow A \hat{\otimes} A^+$ that are sections for the multiplication maps. Since any element $a \in A$ can be written as $\lim u_n \cdot a$ for some approximate unit (u_n) , we have $l(a) = \lim u_n \cdot l(a)$. Therefore, the range of l is contained in $A \hat{\otimes} A \subseteq A^+ \hat{\otimes} A$. The same argument shows that r maps into $A \hat{\otimes} A$.

Lemma 15 ([17, Lemma 4.4]). *Let A be a quasi-unital algebra and let M be a bornological left A -module. Then the natural map $A \hat{\otimes}_A M \rightarrow A^+ \hat{\otimes}_A M \cong M$ is always injective.*

The following proposition is related to [17, Proposition 4.7].

Proposition 16. *Let A be a quasi-unital algebra, let M be a bornological left A -module, and define $\mu: A \hat{\otimes} M \rightarrow M$ by $\mu(a \otimes m) := am$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- 16.1. $\mu: A \hat{\otimes} M \rightarrow M$ is a bornological quotient map;
- 16.2. $\mu: A \hat{\otimes} M \rightarrow M$ has a bounded linear section;
- 16.3. the map $\mu_*: A \hat{\otimes}_A M \rightarrow M$ induced by μ is a bornological isomorphism.

Proof. Since $\mu(a_1 a_2 \otimes m) = \mu(a_1 \otimes a_2 m)$, it induces a map $\mu_*: A \hat{\otimes}_A M \rightarrow M$, which is injective by Lemma 15. Hence it is a bornological isomorphism if and only if it is a bornological quotient map. This is equivalent to μ itself being a bornological

quotient map because $A \hat{\otimes} M \rightarrow A \hat{\otimes}_A M$ is a bornological quotient map. Thus 16.1 and 16.3 are equivalent. Trivially, 16.2 implies 16.1. Conversely, the right module map $r: A \rightarrow A \hat{\otimes} A$ induces a map

$$r': A \hat{\otimes}_A M \xrightarrow{r \hat{\otimes}_A \text{id}} A \hat{\otimes} A \hat{\otimes}_A M \xrightarrow{\text{id}_A \hat{\otimes} \mu_*} A \hat{\otimes} M$$

such that $\mu \circ r' = \mu_*$. Hence 16.3 implies 16.2. $\square$

Definition 17. We call a module M over a quasi-unital algebra *essential* if it satisfies the equivalent conditions of Proposition 16. We let $\mathbf{Mod}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{Mod}(A^+)$ be the full subcategory of essential modules.

Example 18. Unital algebras are quasi-unital. The unit is an approximate identity, and we can take $r(a) = 1 \otimes a$ and $l(a) := a \otimes 1$. An A -module is essential if and only if it is unital. Thus our notation is compatible with our previous definitions for unital algebras.

Example 19. Let M be a smooth manifold and let $\mathcal{D}(M)$ be the algebra of smooth functions on M with compact support and with the pointwise multiplication. This algebra is quasi-unital. There is a sequence $(\phi_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in $\mathcal{D}(M)$ with $\sum \phi_n^2 = 1$. Then $u_n := \sum_{m \leq n} \phi_m^2$ is an approximate identity in $\mathcal{D}(M)$ and we can take

$$r(a) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \phi_n \otimes \phi_n a, \quad l(a) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} a \phi_n \otimes \phi_n.$$

A $\mathcal{D}(M)$ -module M is essential if and only if for any bounded subset $S \subseteq M$ there is $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $u_n \cdot m = m$ for all $m \in S$.

Example 20. The convolution algebra $\mathcal{D}(G)$ for a locally compact group G is quasi-unital. The category $\mathbf{Mod}(\mathcal{D}(G))$ is isomorphic to the category of smooth representations of G on bornological vector spaces ([17]).

4.2. Smoothing and roughening functors.

Definition 21. Let A be a quasi-unital algebra. The *smoothing functor* and the *roughening functor* for A are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ess} = \text{Ess}_A: \mathbf{Mod}(A^+) &\rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(A^+), & M &\mapsto A \hat{\otimes}_A M, \\ \text{Rgh} = \text{Rgh}_A: \mathbf{Mod}(A^+) &\rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(A^+), & M &\mapsto \text{Hom}_A(A, M). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 22. The functor Ess is an idempotent functor from $\mathbf{Mod}(A^+)$ onto the full subcategory $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$. We have a natural bornological isomorphism

$$\text{Hom}_A(M, \text{Ess } N) \cong \text{Hom}_A(M, N) \quad \forall M \in \mathbf{Mod}(A), N \in \mathbf{Mod}(A^+).$$

As a consequence, $\text{Ess}: \mathbf{Mod}(A^+) \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(A)$ is right adjoint to the embedding functor $\mathbf{Mod}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(A^+)$.

When viewed as functors on $\mathbf{Mod}(A^+)$, the functors Ess and Rgh satisfy

$$\text{Ess}^2 \cong \text{Ess}, \quad \text{Rgh}^2 \cong \text{Rgh}, \quad \text{Ess} \circ \text{Rgh} \cong \text{Ess}, \quad \text{Rgh} \circ \text{Ess} \cong \text{Rgh}.$$

There is a natural isomorphism

$$\text{Hom}_A(\text{Ess}(M), N) \cong \text{Hom}_A(M, \text{Rgh}(N))$$

for all $M, N \in \mathbf{Mod}(A^+)$, so that Ess is left adjoint to Rgh .

Proof. The multiplication map $A \hat{\otimes} A \rightarrow A$ has a bounded linear section because A is quasi-unital. Hence $A \hat{\otimes}_A A \cong A$ by Proposition 16. Since the balanced tensor product is associative, this means that Ess is idempotent. By definition, $\text{Ess}(M) \cong M$ if and only if M is essential. Thus Ess is a projection from $\mathbf{Mod}(A^+)$ onto $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$. The map $\text{Ess}(N) \rightarrow N$ is bounded and injective for all N by Lemma 15. Therefore, the induced map $\text{Hom}_A(M, \text{Ess}(N)) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_A(M, N)$ is bounded and injective as

well. If M is essential, then the natural map $\text{Ess}(M) \rightarrow M$ is a bornological isomorphism. Since smoothening is functorial, any map $M \rightarrow N$ restricts to a map $M \cong \text{Ess}(M) \rightarrow \text{Ess}(N)$. This provides a bounded section for the bounded injective map above, so that $\text{Hom}_A(M, \text{Ess}(N)) \cong \text{Hom}_A(M, N)$.

Adjoint associativity (5) implies $\text{Hom}_A(\text{Ess}(M), N) \cong \text{Hom}_A(M, \text{Rgh}(N))$ for all $M, N \in_O \text{Mod}(A^+)$. We already observed above that $\text{Ess}^2 \cong \text{Ess}$. By adjointness, this implies $\text{Rgh}^2 \cong \text{Rgh}$. Adjointness assertions also yield

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_A(M, \text{Rgh} \text{Ess } N) &\cong \text{Hom}_A(\text{Ess } M, \text{Ess } N) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_A(\text{Ess } M, N) \cong \text{Hom}_A(M, \text{Rgh } N) \end{aligned}$$

for all $M, N \in_O \text{Mod}(A^+)$. Hence $\text{Rgh} \text{Ess} \cong \text{Rgh}$. Finally, If $M \in_O \text{Mod}(A)$, $N \in_O \text{Mod}(A^+)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_A(M, \text{Ess} \text{Rgh } N) &\cong \text{Hom}_A(M, \text{Rgh } N) \cong \text{Hom}_A(\text{Ess } M, N) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_A(M, N) \cong \text{Hom}_A(M, \text{Ess } N). \end{aligned}$$

Since both $\text{Ess} \text{Rgh } N$ and $\text{Ess } N$ belong to $\text{Mod}(A)$, this implies $\text{Ess} \text{Rgh} \cong \text{Ess}$. $\square$

Corollary 23. *The smoothening functor $\text{Ess}: \text{Mod}(A^+) \rightarrow \text{Mod}(A^+)$ is exact and preserves projectives, and it commutes with arbitrary direct limits in the category $\text{Mod}(A^+)$.*

Proof. The functors Rgh and Ess are exact on $\text{Mod}(A^+)$ because A is projective as a right A -module. Since the right adjoint Rgh of Ess is exact, Ess maps projectives in $\text{Mod}(A^+)$ to projectives in $\text{Mod}(A^+)$. Furthermore, Ess commutes with direct limits in $\text{Mod}(A^+)$ because it has a right adjoint. $\square$

Theorem 24. *The subcategory $\text{Mod}(A) \subseteq \text{Mod}(A^+)$ is exact and hereditary for subspaces and quotients. That is, if $K \rightarrowtail E \twoheadrightarrow Q$ is a conflation in $\text{Mod}(A^+)$, then E is essential if and only if K and Q are both essential.*

Proof. Let $K \rightarrowtail E \twoheadrightarrow Q$ be a conflation in $\text{Mod}(A^+)$. Since smoothening is exact, the rows in the commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \text{Ess } K & \longrightarrow & \text{Ess } E & \longrightarrow & \text{Ess } Q \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ K & \longrightarrow & E & \longrightarrow & Q \end{array}$$

are conflations. Suppose first that E is essential. It is easy to see that quotients of essential modules are again essential. Hence the maps $\text{Ess } E \rightarrow E$ and $\text{Ess } Q \rightarrow Q$ are isomorphisms by Theorem 22. It follows that the map $\text{Ess } K \rightarrow K$ is an isomorphism as well, that is, K is essential. Thus $\text{Mod}(A)$ is hereditary for subspaces and quotients. Suppose conversely that K and Q are essential. Then the maps $\text{Ess } K \rightarrow K$ and $\text{Ess } Q \rightarrow Q$ are isomorphisms. This implies that the map $\text{Ess } E \rightarrow E$ is an isomorphism by the Five Lemma. Thus E is essential. $\square$

4.3. Derived categories of essential modules.

Theorem 25. *Let A be a quasi-unital bornological algebra. The category $\text{Mod}(A)$ of essential bornological left A -modules with the class of linearly split extensions is a complete, cocomplete exact category. It has enough projectives and injectives.*

The embedding $\text{Mod}(A) \rightarrow \text{Mod}(A^+)$ is exact, preserves projectives, and commutes with direct limits and finite inverse limits.

Proof. The category $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ is an exact subcategory of $\mathbf{Mod}(A^+)$ by Theorem 24 (that is, it is closed under extensions) and hence an exact category in its own right. We already know that $\mathbf{Mod}(A^+)$ is complete and cocomplete. The subcategory $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ is evidently closed under direct sums in $\mathbf{Mod}(A^+)$. It is also hereditary for subspaces and quotients by Theorem 24. Therefore, $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ is closed under arbitrary direct limits and finite inverse limits. The inverse limit $\varprojlim M \in \mathbf{Mod}(A^+)$ of a diagram M in $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ need not belong to $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ any more. However, $\text{Ess} \varprojlim M$ has the right universal property for an inverse limit in the subcategory $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ by Theorem 22. Hence $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ is still a complete, cocomplete exact category and the embedding into $\mathbf{Mod}(A^+)$ commutes with direct limits and finite inverse limits, but not necessarily with infinite inverse limits.

Since $\mathbf{Mod}(A^+)$ has enough projectives and injectives, any $M \in_O \mathbf{Mod}(A)$ has a projective resolution $P \twoheadrightarrow M$ and an injective coresolution $M \hookrightarrow I$ in $\mathbf{Mod}(A^+)$. By Corollary 23, $\text{Ess} P \twoheadrightarrow M$ is a projective resolution in $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$. Even more, $\text{Ess} P$ is still projective in $\mathbf{Mod}(A^+)$. Therefore, $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ has enough projectives and the embedding into $\mathbf{Mod}(A^+)$ preserves projectives. Since Ess is right adjoint to an exact functor, it maps injectives in $\mathbf{Mod}(A^+)$ to injectives in $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ (however, these need not be injective in $\mathbf{Mod}(A^+)$ any more). Since Ess is also exact, $M \hookrightarrow \text{Ess} I$ is an injective coresolution of M in $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$. Hence $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$ has enough injectives. $\square$

Let $R \subseteq \mathbf{Mod}(A^+)$ be the subcategory of rough modules. Then $\text{Ess}: R \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(A)$ and $\text{Rgh}: \mathbf{Mod}(A) \rightarrow R$ are isomorphisms of exact categories. Hence there is no need to study the category of rough modules.

We let $\mathbf{Ho}(A)$ be the homotopy category of unbounded chain complexes over $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$. Let $\mathbf{Exact}(A) \subseteq \mathbf{Ho}(A)$ be the subcategory of exact chain complexes and let $\mathbf{Der}(A)$ be the localisation of $\mathbf{Ho}(A)$ at $\mathbf{Exact}(A)$. Theorem 25 allows to extend the assertions about $\mathbf{Ho}(A)$ and $\mathbf{Der}(A)$ for unital A in Section 3 to the case of quasi-unital A . That is, $\mathbf{Ho}(A)$ is still a triangulated category with direct sums and products, and $\mathbf{Exact}(A)$ is a localising subcategory. The category $\mathbf{Ho}(A)$ has enough projectives and injectives, and projective and injective approximations are functorial. Analogues of Propositions 6 and 10 also hold, if we replace free and cofree modules in the statement of Proposition 10 by the special projective and injective modules of the form $A \hat{\otimes} X$ and $\text{Ess} \text{Hom}(A, X)$.

Since we can find projective resolutions in the category $\mathbf{Mod}(A^+)$ that lie in the subcategory $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$, the natural map $\mathbf{Der}(A) \rightarrow \mathbf{Der}(A^+)$ is fully faithful. Since Ess and Rgh are exact functors, they give rise to triangulated functors on $\mathbf{Ho}(A^+)$ and $\mathbf{Der}(A^+)$. All the assertions of Theorem 22 remain valid in these categories.

We can modify the statement of adjoint associativity so that all involved objects again belong to the appropriate derived categories of *essential* modules. One checks easily that $M \hat{\otimes}_A N$ is an essential B, C -bimodule if M and N are essential B, A - and A, C -bimodules. This implies the corresponding assertion for chain complexes and hence for $M \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} N$. Using the properties of the smoothening, we easily get

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_{B,C}(M \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} N, X) &\cong \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_{A,C}(N, \text{Ess}_{A \hat{\otimes} C^{\text{op}}} \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_B(M, X)) \\ &\cong \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_{B,A}(M, \text{Ess}_{B \hat{\otimes} A^{\text{op}}} \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_C(N, X)) \end{aligned}$$

for all $M \in_O \mathbf{Der}(B \hat{\otimes} A^{\text{op}})$, $N \in_O \mathbf{Der}(A \hat{\otimes} C^{\text{op}})$, $X \in_O \mathbf{Der}(B \hat{\otimes} C^{\text{op}})$.

4.4. Multiplier algebras and Morita equivalence. Let A be a quasi-unital bornological algebra. The *left and right multiplier algebras* $\mathcal{M}_l(A)$ and $\mathcal{M}_r(A)$ are defined as the algebras of bounded right and left A -module homomorphisms $A \rightarrow A$, respectively. The *multiplier algebra* of A is the algebra of pairs (L, R) consisting of a left and a right multiplier, such that $a \cdot L(b) = R(a) \cdot b$ for all $a, b \in A$. It is a closed

unital subalgebra of $\mathcal{M}_l(A) \oplus \mathcal{M}_r(A)^{\text{op}}$. There is a canonical map $A \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(A)$, which is injective if A is quasi-unital (see also [17]).

For example, if G is a Lie group, then the multiplier algebra of the convolution algebra $\mathcal{D}(G)$ is the algebra of compactly supported distributions on G ([17]). The multiplier algebra of $\mathcal{D}(M)$ with the pointwise multiplication is $\mathcal{E}(M)$, the space of smooth functions on M without support restriction. If A is unital, then $A \cong \mathcal{M}(A)$.

By definition, A is a $\mathcal{M}_l(A)$, A -bimodule. Hence $\text{Ess}(M) := A \hat{\otimes}_A M$ carries a canonical $\mathcal{M}_l(A)$ -module structure for any $M \in {}_O \text{Mod}(A^+)$. Thus essential A -modules are at the same time also bornological unital $\mathcal{M}_l(A)$ -modules. Similarly, essential right A -modules are bornological unital $\mathcal{M}_r(A)$ -modules. Both kinds of modules are bornological unital modules over $\mathcal{M}(A)$ and $\mathcal{M}(A)^{\text{op}}$, respectively. Thus we get a functor $E: \text{Mod}(A) \rightarrow \text{Mod}(\mathcal{M}(A))$. We also have a forgetful functor $F: \text{Mod}(\mathcal{M}(A)) \rightarrow \text{Mod}(A)$, $M \mapsto A \hat{\otimes}_A M$. One can show that $A \hat{\otimes}_A M \cong A \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{M}(A)} M$.

Proposition 26. *The functor $E: \text{Mod}(A) \rightarrow \text{Mod}(\mathcal{M}(A))$ is left adjoint to the functor $F: \text{Mod}(\mathcal{M}(A)) \rightarrow \text{Mod}(A)$. The functor E is exact, fully faithful, commutes with direct limits, and preserves projectives. The functor $E: \text{Der}(A) \rightarrow \text{Der}(\mathcal{M}(A))$ obtained from E is also fully faithful.*

Proof. It is clear that E is fully faithful. The adjointness of E and F therefore follows from the universal property of the smoothening. The adjointness of E and F implies that E preserves projectives and commutes with direct limits because F is exact. Exactness of E is trivial and implies that E gives rise to a functor $\text{Der}(A) \rightarrow \text{Der}(\mathcal{M}(A))$. The latter is still fully faithful because E is fully faithful and preserves projectives. $\square$

The above construction is not an equivalence of categories. For instance, $\mathcal{M}(A)$ itself is not an essential A -module. We have $\text{Ess } \mathcal{M}(A) = A$ because

$$\text{Ess } \mathcal{M}(A) \subseteq \text{Ess } \mathcal{M}_l(A) = \text{Ess Rgh}(A) = A.$$

One may wonder which category one should study, unital $\mathcal{M}(A)$ -modules or essential A -modules. I prefer the latter setting. One reason for this is that $\mathcal{M}(A)$ can become rather unwieldy. This happens, for instance, if $A = \mathcal{D}(G)$ for a reductive group over the adèle ring of $\mathbb{Q}$. Moreover, some important Morita equivalences work for $\text{Mod}(A)$ but not for $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{M}(A))$.

Let A and B be quasi-unital bornological algebras. A *Morita equivalence* between A and B is given by essential bimodules $P \in {}_O \text{Mod}(A \hat{\otimes} B^{\text{op}})$, $Q \in {}_O \text{Mod}(B \hat{\otimes} A^{\text{op}})$ together with bounded bimodule isomorphisms $P \hat{\otimes}_B Q \cong A$, $Q \hat{\otimes}_A P \cong B$, such that P is projective as a B -module and Q is projective as an A -module.

Given such bimodules, we define functors $M \mapsto P \hat{\otimes}_B M$ and $M \mapsto Q \hat{\otimes}_A M$ between $\text{Mod}(A)$ and $\text{Mod}(B)$. By hypothesis, these two functors are inverse to each other. Hence we get an equivalence of categories $\text{Mod}(A) \cong \text{Mod}(B)$. The projectivity hypothesis on P and Q ensures that these two functors are exact. It is conceivable that the projectivity of P and Q holds automatically. I have not seriously investigated Morita equivalence and present it here only to exhibit a problem with the category $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{M}(A))$.

Consider the following rather simple example. Let $A = \mathbb{C}$ and let B the Banach algebra $\ell_1(H)$ of trace class operators on a separable Hilbert space H . Equip $\ell_1(H)$ with the von Neumann bornology. One can check that the Hilbert space H viewed as column and row vectors gives a Morita equivalence between $\mathbb{C}$ and $\ell_1(H)$ in the above sense. Hence the categories $\text{Mod}(\mathbb{C})$ and $\text{Mod}(\ell_1(H))$ are equivalent. The multiplier algebra of $\ell_1(H)$ is the algebra of all bounded operators on H . Its canonical bornology is equal to the von Neumann bornology coming from the

usual operator norm. The compact operators on H form a closed two-sided ideal in $\mathcal{M}(\ell_1(H))$. Since the ideal structure is an invariant under Morita equivalence, $\mathcal{M}(\ell_1(H))$ cannot be Morita equivalent to $\mathbb{C}$. Hence the module categories $\mathbf{Mod}(\mathbb{C})$ and $\mathbf{Mod}(\mathcal{M}(\ell_1(H)))$ are not equivalent.

4.5. Morphisms between quasi-unital bornological algebras. Throughout this section, we let A and B be quasi-unital bornological algebras. A bounded homomorphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ can always be extended to a bounded unital homomorphism $f^+: A^+ \rightarrow B^+$ and hence induces a functor $f^* := (f^+)^*: \mathbf{Mod}(B^+) \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(A^+)$. However, this functor need not map $\mathbf{Mod}(B)$ into $\mathbf{Mod}(A)$. A necessary condition for this is that $f^*(B) \in \mathbf{Mod}(A)$, that is, $A \hat{\otimes}_A B \cong B$. In the following, we frequently write B instead of $f^*(B)$ to avoid clutter. We call a bounded homomorphism $f: A \rightarrow B$ *essential* if B is an essential A -bimodule, that is,

$$A \hat{\otimes}_A B \hat{\otimes}_A A \cong A \hat{\otimes}_A B \cong B \hat{\otimes}_A B \cong B.$$

More generally, we may consider a bounded algebra homomorphism $f: A \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(B)$. This still allows us to view B as an A -bimodule. We call f a *morphism* and write $f: A \dashrightarrow B$ if B is an essential A -bimodule. A morphism $f: A \dashrightarrow B$ is called *proper* if f is a bounded map $A \rightarrow B$. Notice that not all bounded algebra homomorphisms $A \rightarrow B$ are proper morphisms in the above sense: we require, in addition, that B should be an essential A -bimodule.

If A is unital, then a morphism $f: A \dashrightarrow B$ is the same as a bounded unital algebra homomorphism $A \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(B)$. Hence morphisms $A \dashrightarrow B$ are the same as bounded unital algebra homomorphisms if both A and B are unital.

Lemma 27. *Any morphism $f: A \dashrightarrow B$ extends uniquely to a bounded unital algebra homomorphism $\bar{f}: \mathcal{M}(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(B)$.*

If $f: A \dashrightarrow B$ and $g: B \dashrightarrow C$ are morphisms, then $\bar{g} \circ f: A \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(B) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(C)$ is a morphism $A \dashrightarrow C$, denoted $g \circ f$. The quasi-unital bornological algebras form a category with this composition of morphisms.

Proof. Let $f: A \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(B)$ be a morphism. Since elements of the form $a \cdot b$ with $a \in A$, $b \in B$, span a dense subspace of B , the extension $\bar{f}$ is unique if it exists. We can view B as a unital bimodule over $\mathcal{M}(A)$ because it is an essential A -module. This defines a bounded unital algebra homomorphism $\bar{f}: \mathcal{M}(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(B)$ extending f .

To check that $\bar{g} \circ f$ is a morphism, we must show that C is an essential bimodule over A . Since f and g are morphisms, we get

$$\begin{aligned} A \hat{\otimes}_A C \hat{\otimes}_A A &\cong A \hat{\otimes}_A (B \hat{\otimes}_B C \hat{\otimes}_B B) \hat{\otimes}_A A \\ &\cong (A \hat{\otimes}_A B) \hat{\otimes}_B C \hat{\otimes}_B (B \hat{\otimes}_A A) \cong B \hat{\otimes}_B C \hat{\otimes}_B B \cong C \end{aligned}$$

as desired. It is easy to see that the composition of morphisms defined above gives rise to a category. $\square$

We get a functor from the category of quasi-unital algebras to the category of unital algebras by sending $A \mapsto \mathcal{M}(A)$, $f \mapsto \bar{f}$. This functor is faithful because the canonical map $A \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(A)$ is injective for algebras with an approximate identity. However, it is not fully faithful, that is, there are bounded unital algebra homomorphisms $\mathcal{M}(A) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(B)$ that do not come from a morphism $A \dashrightarrow B$.

The following lemma is useful to check that an algebra is quasi-unital.

Lemma 28. *Let $f: A \rightarrow B$ be a bounded homomorphism between two bornological algebras. If A is quasi-unital and $f^*(B)$ is an essential A -bimodule, then B is also quasi-unital and f is a proper morphism $A \rightarrow B$.*

Proof. Let $S \subseteq B$ be bounded. There exist bounded disks $S_A \subseteq A$ and $S_B \subseteq B$ such that $S \subseteq f(S_A) \cdot S_B \cdot f(S_A)$ because the multiplication map $A \hat{\otimes} B \hat{\otimes} A \rightarrow B$ is supposed to be a bornological quotient map. Since A is quasi-unital, we can find a sequence (u_n) in A that acts as an approximate identity on S_A . Then $f(u_n)$ serves as an approximate identity on $f(S_A) \cdot S_B \cdot f(S_A)$ and hence also on S . Thus B has an approximate identity. The right A -module section $r: A \rightarrow A \hat{\otimes} A$ for the multiplication map induces a bounded right B -module homomorphism

$$r_*: B \cong A \hat{\otimes}_A B \xrightarrow{r} A \hat{\otimes} A \hat{\otimes}_A B \cong A \hat{\otimes} B \xrightarrow{f \hat{\otimes} \text{id}_B} B \hat{\otimes} B$$

with $\mu_B \circ r_* = \text{id}_B$. A left module section is constructed similarly. $\square$

4.6. Functoriality of module categories and derived categories. We let $f: A \dashrightarrow B$ be a morphism, described by a bounded algebra homomorphism $f: A \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(B)$. We may view B as a B, A -bimodule or as an A, B -bimodule via f . This yields four additive functors

$$\begin{aligned} f_!: \text{Mod}(A) &\rightarrow \text{Mod}(B), & f_!(M) &:= B \hat{\otimes}_A M, \\ f_*: \text{Mod}(A) &\rightarrow \text{Mod}(B), & f_*(M) &:= \text{Ess}_B \text{Hom}_A(B, M), \\ f^*: \text{Mod}(B) &\rightarrow \text{Mod}(A), & f^*(M) &:= B \hat{\otimes}_B M, \\ f^!: \text{Mod}(B) &\rightarrow \text{Mod}(A), & f^!(M) &:= \text{Ess}_A \text{Hom}_B(B, M). \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of essential modules, $f^*(M)$ is equal to M viewed as a left A -module via $A \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(B) \rightarrow \text{End}(M)$, where the second map is the unique bounded extension of the B -module structure $B \rightarrow \text{End}(M)$.

Example 29. Let G be a locally compact group and let $H \subseteq G$ be a closed subgroup. Then we get an induced homomorphism $\mathcal{D}(H) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(G)$ by sending $f \in \mathcal{D}(H)$ to the multiplier of $\mathcal{D}(G)$ associated to the compactly supported distribution $\psi \mapsto \int \psi(h) f(h) d\lambda_H(h)$ on G , where $d\lambda_H$ denotes a left invariant Haar measure on H . This defines a morphism $i_H^G: \mathcal{D}(H) \dashrightarrow \mathcal{D}(G)$. It is proper if and only if H is an open subgroup of G . The category $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{D}(G))$ is isomorphic to the category of smooth representations of G ([17]). Under this isomorphism, the functors $(i_H^G)^*$, $(i_H^G)_*$, and $(i_H^G)!$ correspond to the restriction functor, the induction functor, and the compact induction functor twisted by a relative modular function (see [17]). The functor $(i_H^G)^!$ is called rough restriction functor in [17] and does not agree with any classical construction.

Proposition 30. *Let $f: A \dashrightarrow B$ be a morphism. Then there are natural bornological isomorphisms*

$$\text{Hom}_B(N, f_*(M)) \cong \text{Hom}_A(f^*(N), M), \quad \text{Hom}_B(f_!(M), N) \cong \text{Hom}_A(M, f^!(N))$$

for all $M \in_O \text{Mod}(A)$, $N \in_O \text{Mod}(B)$. Thus f^* is left adjoint to f_* and $f_!$ is left adjoint to $f^!$.

Proof. Use adjoint associativity and the universal property of Ess . $\square$

The following proposition uses the functor $f^*: \text{Mod}(B^+) \rightarrow \text{Mod}(A^+)$ induced by a proper morphism $f: A \rightarrow B$. Notice that its restriction to the subcategory $\text{Mod}(B)$ agrees with the functor f^* defined above.

Proposition 31. *Let $f: A \rightarrow B$ be a proper morphism. Then the natural maps*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ess}_A(f^* M) &= A \hat{\otimes}_A M \rightarrow B \hat{\otimes}_B M = f^*(\text{Ess}_B M), \\ f^*(\text{Rgh}_B M) &= \text{Hom}_B(B, M) \rightarrow \text{Hom}_A(A, f^* M) = \text{Rgh}_A f^*(M), \end{aligned}$$

induced by $f: A \rightarrow B$ are bornological isomorphisms for all $M \in_O \text{Mod}(B^+)$. Therefore, $f^! = f^*$.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 15 that the natural bounded A -module homomorphisms $\text{Ess}_A f^*(M) \rightarrow f^*M$ and $f^*(\text{Ess}_B M) \rightarrow f^*M$ are injective. We claim that $\text{Ess}_A(f^*M)$ and $f^*(\text{Ess}_B M)$ are the same subspace of f^*M with the same bornology. We have a bounded inclusion $\text{Ess}_A(f^*M) = A \hat{\otimes}_A M \rightarrow B \hat{\otimes}_B M = f^*(\text{Ess}_B M)$. Since $f^*(\text{Ess}_B M)$ is an essential A -module, Theorem 22 yields that the map $f^*(\text{Ess}_B M) \rightarrow f^*M$ factors through $\text{Ess}_A f^*(M)$. Hence $\text{Ess}_A f^*(M) = f^*(\text{Ess}_B M)$ as asserted.

We use this and the general properties of smoothening and roughening functors to prove $f^*(\text{Rgh}_B M) \cong \text{Rgh}_A f^*(M)$. We have natural isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Rgh}_A f^*(M) &\cong \text{Rgh}_A \text{Ess}_A f^*(M) \cong \text{Rgh}_A f^*(\text{Ess}_B M) \\ &\cong \text{Rgh}_A f^*(\text{Ess}_B \text{Rgh}_B M) \cong \text{Rgh}_A \text{Ess}_A f^* \text{Rgh}_B M \cong \text{Rgh}_A f^*(\text{Rgh}_B M). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, adjoint associativity implies

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Rgh}_A f^*(\text{Rgh}_B M) &= \text{Hom}_A(A, f^* \text{Hom}_B(B, M)) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_B(A \hat{\otimes}_A B, M) \cong f^* \text{Hom}_B(B, M) = f^*(\text{Rgh}_B M). \end{aligned}$$

Putting things together, we obtain $\text{Rgh}_A f^*(M) \cong f^*(\text{Rgh}_B M)$ as desired. Hence $f^!(M) = \text{Ess}_A f^*(\text{Rgh}_B M) \cong \text{Ess}_A f^*(M) \cong f^*(M)$ by Theorem 22. $\square$

Evidently, $f_!$ and f^* commute with direct limits and f_* and $f^!$ commute with inverse limits. Moreover, the functors $f^!$ and f^* are exact because B is projective as a left or right B -module. Therefore, their adjoint functors $f_!$ and f_* preserve projectives and injectives, respectively. This can also be seen directly from

$$f_!(A \hat{\otimes} X) \cong B \hat{\otimes} X, \quad f_*(\text{Ess}_A \text{Hom}(A, X)) \cong \text{Ess}_B \text{Hom}(B, X).$$

The first assertion is trivial, the second one follows from adjoint associativity.

The same constructions define triangulated functors

$$f_!, f_*: \text{Ho}(A) \rightarrow \text{Ho}(B), \quad f^*, f^!: \text{Ho}(B) \rightarrow \text{Ho}(A).$$

By exactness, $f^*, f^!: \text{Ho}(B) \rightarrow \text{Ho}(A)$ descend to functors $f^*, f^!: \text{Der}(B) \rightarrow \text{Der}(A)$. Of course, we still have $f^* = f^!$ on $\text{Der}(B)$ if f is proper. The functors $f_!$ and f_* need not be exact. As a substitute, we have their derived functors

$$\mathbb{L} f_!, \mathbb{R} f_*: \text{Der}(A) \rightarrow \text{Der}(B).$$

They are defined by applying $f_!$ to a projective approximation and f_* to an injective approximation, respectively. Thus

$$\mathbb{L} f_!(M) = B \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} M, \quad \mathbb{R} f_*(M) = \text{Ess}_B(\mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_A(B, M)).$$

Theorem 32. *For any morphism $f: A \dashrightarrow B$ there are natural isomorphisms*

$$(15) \quad \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_B(N, \mathbb{R} f_*(M)) \cong \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_A(f^*(N), M),$$

$$(16) \quad \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_B(\mathbb{L} f_!(M), N) \cong \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_A(M, f^!(N)),$$

in Ho. Thus $\mathbb{R} f_$ is right adjoint to $f^*: \text{Der}(B) \rightarrow \text{Der}(A)$ and $\mathbb{L} f_!$ is left adjoint to $f^!: \text{Der}(B) \rightarrow \text{Der}(A)$.*

Proof. Observe first that the adjointness relations of Proposition 30 extend to the homotopy categories of chain complexes. Let $P(M) \rightarrow M \rightarrow I(M)$ be the projective and injective approximation functors. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_B(N, \mathbb{R} f_*(M)) &\cong \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_B(N, f_*(I(M))) \cong \text{Hom}_B(N, f_*(I(M))) \\ &\cong \text{Hom}_A(f^*N, I(M)) \cong \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_A(f^*N, M) \end{aligned}$$

because f_* preserves injectives. This argument also uses Proposition 11. A similar computation, which uses that $f_!$ preserves projectives, yields (16). $\square$

There are canonical maps

$$(17) \quad f^*: \mathbb{R} \operatorname{Hom}_B(M, N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \operatorname{Hom}_A(f^*M, f^*N),$$

$$(18) \quad f^!: \mathbb{R} \operatorname{Hom}_B(M, N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \operatorname{Hom}_A(f^!M, f^!N),$$

$$(19) \quad f_*: \mathbb{R} \operatorname{Hom}_A(M, N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \operatorname{Hom}_B(\mathbb{R} f_*M, \mathbb{R} f_*N),$$

$$(20) \quad f_!: \mathbb{R} \operatorname{Hom}_A(M, N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \operatorname{Hom}_B(\mathbb{L} f_!M, \mathbb{L} f_!N)$$

in $\mathbf{Ho}$. They have the characteristic property that when passing to homology, we get the action of the functors f^* , $f^!$, $\mathbb{R} f_*$, and $\mathbb{L} f_!$ on the spaces of morphisms in the derived categories. There is a natural map

$$(21) \quad f_*: f^*(M) \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} f^*(N) \rightarrow M \hat{\otimes}_B^{\mathbb{L}} N$$

as well. The constructions are essentially the same in all cases. Let us construct f^* . Choose a projective approximation $P(M) \rightarrow M$ and consider $f^*(P(M)) \in {}_O \mathbf{Ho}(A)$. Since f^* is exact, the map $f^*(P(M)) \rightarrow f^*(M)$ is a quasi-isomorphism. Hence a projective approximation for $f^*(P(M))$ is a projective approximation for $f^*(M)$ as well. Hence we get bounded linear chain maps

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{R} \operatorname{Hom}_B(M, N) &\cong \operatorname{Hom}_B(P(M), N) \rightarrow \operatorname{Hom}_A(f^*P(M), f^*N) \\ &\rightarrow \mathbb{R} \operatorname{Hom}_A(f^*P(M), f^*N) \cong \mathbb{R} \operatorname{Hom}_A(f^*M, f^*N). \end{aligned}$$

The resulting map $\mathbb{R} \operatorname{Hom}_B(M, N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \operatorname{Hom}_A(f^*M, f^*N)$ does not depend on auxiliary choices and yields a natural transformation between these bifunctors. Moreover, the construction of f^* is functorial (up to chain homotopy), that is, $\operatorname{id}^* = \operatorname{id}$ and $f^*g^* = (gf)^*$ in $\mathbf{Ho}$.

5. ISOCOHOMOLOGICAL MORPHISMS

Let A and B be two quasi-unital bornological algebras and let $i: A \dashrightarrow B$ be a morphism. We want to investigate when $i^*: \operatorname{Der}(B) \rightarrow \operatorname{Der}(A)$ is fully faithful.

Consider first the functor $i^*: \operatorname{Mod}(B) \rightarrow \operatorname{Mod}(A)$. Since i^*M and M have the same underlying bornological vector space, we get a bornological embedding $\operatorname{Hom}_A(i^*M, i^*N) \subseteq \operatorname{Hom}_B(M, N)$ for all $M, N \in {}_O \operatorname{Mod}(B)$. Equality holds, for instance, if i is a proper morphism that has dense range in the sense that $\overline{i(A)} = B$. Thus $i^*: \operatorname{Mod}(B) \rightarrow \operatorname{Mod}(A)$ is always faithful, and fully faithful for proper morphisms with dense range. However, this does not suffice to conclude that $i^*: \operatorname{Der}(B) \rightarrow \operatorname{Der}(A)$ is fully faithful because of the following proposition.

Proposition 33. *If $i^*: \operatorname{Der}(B) \rightarrow \operatorname{Der}(A)$ is fully faithful, then the subcategory $i^*\operatorname{Mod}(B) \subseteq \operatorname{Mod}(A)$ is closed under extensions with a bounded linear section.*

Proof. We can describe $\operatorname{Ext}_B^1(M, N)$ using either morphisms in the derived category or isomorphism classes of conflations. The first description yields

$$\operatorname{Ext}_B^1(M, N) \cong \operatorname{Ext}_A^1(i^*M, i^*N) \quad \forall M, N \in {}_O \operatorname{Mod}(B)$$

if $i^*: \operatorname{Der}(B) \rightarrow \operatorname{Der}(A)$ is fully faithful. By the second description, this means that any conflation $M \rightarrowtail E \twoheadrightarrow N$ in $\operatorname{Mod}(A)$ with $M, N \in {}_O \operatorname{Mod}(B)$ is isomorphic to one in $i^*\operatorname{Mod}(B)$. In particular, $E \in i^*\operatorname{Mod}(B)$, as desired. $\square$

Example 34. Consider the Banach convolution algebras $A = \mathcal{S}^1(\mathbb{Z})$ and $B = \ell_1(\mathbb{Z})$ on the group of integers $\mathbb{Z}$, which are defined by the norms

$$\|f\|^1 := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |f(n)|(|n| + 1), \quad \|f\|^0 := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |f(n)|.$$

Let $i: A \rightarrow B$ be the inclusion. We claim that $i^*\operatorname{Mod}(B) \subseteq \operatorname{Mod}(A)$ is not closed under extensions. Hence $i^*: \operatorname{Der}(B) \rightarrow \operatorname{Der}(A)$ cannot be fully faithful. A similar counterexample exists for the embedding $C^1(S^1) \rightarrow C(S^1)$.

Equip $\mathbb{C}$ with the trivial representation of $\mathbb{Z}$ and the corresponding module structure over A and B . Consider the representation of $\mathbb{Z}$ on $\mathbb{C}^2$ by

$$\mathbb{Z} \ni n \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} 1 & n \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This is an extension of the trivial representation by itself. Since the norm of these matrices grows linearly in n , it defines a module over $\mathcal{S}^1(\mathbb{Z})$, but not over $\ell_1(\mathbb{Z})$. Hence it is an element of $\text{Ext}_A^1(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C})$ that does not belong to $\text{Ext}_B^1(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C})$.

Recall that $\text{Ho} = \text{Ho}(\text{Bor})$ is the homotopy category of chain complexes over Bor . The natural transformations $i^*: \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_B(M, N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_A(i^*M, i^*N)$ and $i_*: i^*M \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} i^*N \rightarrow M \hat{\otimes}_B^{\mathbb{L}} N$ used below are constructed in (17) and (21).

Theorem 35. *Let $i: A \dashrightarrow B$ be a morphism between two quasi-unital algebras. Let $P_\bullet \rightarrow A$ be a projective A -bimodule resolution of $A \in_O \text{Mod}(A \hat{\otimes} A^{\text{op}})$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- 35.1. $B \hat{\otimes}_A P_\bullet \hat{\otimes}_A B$ is a projective B -bimodule resolution of B .
- 35.2. The map $i_*: B \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} B \rightarrow B \hat{\otimes}_B^{\mathbb{L}} B \cong B$ is an isomorphism in Ho .
- 35.3. The map α in the commuting diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} (\mathbb{L} i_!) \circ i^*(M) & \xrightarrow{\alpha} & M \\ \parallel & & \cong \uparrow \\ i^*(B) \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} i^*(M) & \xrightarrow{i_*} & B \hat{\otimes}_B^{\mathbb{L}} M \end{array}$$

is an isomorphism in $\text{Der}(B)$ for all $M \in_O \text{Der}(B)$.

- 35.4. The map $i_*: i^*(M) \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} i^*(N) \rightarrow M \hat{\otimes}_B^{\mathbb{L}} N$ is an isomorphism in Ho for any $M \in_O \text{Der}(B^{\text{op}})$, $N \in_O \text{Der}(B)$.
- 35.5. The map $i^*: \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_B(B, \text{Hom}(B, X)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_A(B, \text{Hom}(B, X))$ is an isomorphism in Ho for all $X \in_O \text{Bor}$.
- 35.6. The map $i^*: \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_B(B, M) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_A(i^*B, i^*M)$ is an isomorphism in Ho for all $M \in_O \text{Der}(B)$.
- 35.7. The map $i^*: \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_B(M, N) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_A(i^*M, i^*N)$ is an isomorphism in Ho for all $M, N \in_O \text{Der}(B)$.
- 35.8. The natural map

$$M \cong \text{Ess}_B \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_B(B, M) \rightarrow \text{Ess}_B \mathbb{R}\text{Hom}_A(B, M) = (\mathbb{R} i_*) \circ i^*(M)$$

is an isomorphism in $\text{Der}(B)$ for all $M \in_O \text{Der}(B)$.

- 35.9. The functor $i^*: \text{Der}(B) \rightarrow \text{Der}(A)$ is fully faithful.

Proof. First we check the equivalence of 35.1 and 35.2. The functor $X \mapsto X \hat{\otimes}_A B$ maps projective A -bimodules to projective A, B -bimodules. Similarly, $Y \mapsto B \hat{\otimes}_A Y$ maps projective A, B -bimodules to projective B -bimodules. Hence $P_\bullet \hat{\otimes}_A B$ is projective in $\text{Ho}(A \hat{\otimes} B^{\text{op}})$ and $B \hat{\otimes}_A P_\bullet \hat{\otimes}_A B$ is projective in $\text{Ho}(B \hat{\otimes} B^{\text{op}})$. Since A is projective as a right B -module, the map $P_\bullet \rightarrow A$ is an isomorphism in $\text{Ho}(A^{\text{op}})$. Thus $P_\bullet \hat{\otimes}_A B \rightarrow A \hat{\otimes}_A B \cong B$ is a resolution. It is a projective A, B -bimodule resolution of B . It follows that $B \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} B \cong B \hat{\otimes}_A (P_\bullet \hat{\otimes}_A B)$. This is a projective B -bimodule resolution if and only if it is a resolution, if and only if the map $B \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} B \rightarrow B$ is an isomorphism in Ho . Thus 35.1 and 35.2 are equivalent.

We have $B \hat{\otimes}_B^{\mathbb{L}} M \cong B \hat{\otimes}_B M \cong M$ because B is projective and M is essential. Hence the map α in the diagram in 35.3 is an isomorphism if and only if i_* is. Thus 35.4 implies 35.3 and 35.3 implies 35.2. We claim that, conversely, 35.2 implies 35.4. The class of $M \in_O \text{Der}(B^{\text{op}})$ with $i^*(M) \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} i^*(N) \cong M \hat{\otimes}_B^{\mathbb{L}} N$ for all $N \in_O \text{Der}(B)$ is a triangulated subcategory of $\text{Der}(B^{\text{op}})$ and also closed under direct sums. By

the quasi-unital variant of Proposition 10, this subcategory is equal to $\text{Der}(B^{\text{op}})$ once it contains $X \hat{\otimes} B$ for all $X \in_O \text{Bor}$. Fix such an X . The class of $N \in_O \text{Der}(B)$ with $(X \hat{\otimes} B) \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} i^*(N) \cong (X \hat{\otimes} B) \hat{\otimes}_B^{\mathbb{L}} N$ is a triangulated subcategory of $\text{Der}(B)$ closed under direct sums. Again by Proposition 10, it is equal to $\text{Der}(B)$ once it contains $B \hat{\otimes} Y$ for all $Y \in_O \text{Bor}$. Thus $i^*(M) \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} i^*(N) \cong M \hat{\otimes}_B^{\mathbb{L}} N$ holds for all $M \in_O \text{Der}(B^{\text{op}})$, $N \in_O \text{Der}(B)$, once it holds for $M = X \hat{\otimes} B$ and $N = B \hat{\otimes} Y$. Since $X \hat{\otimes} \sqcup$ is an exact functor for extensions with a bounded linear section, we have $(X \hat{\otimes} B) \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} (B \hat{\otimes} Y) \cong X \hat{\otimes} (B \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} B) \hat{\otimes} Y$ and $(X \hat{\otimes} B) \hat{\otimes}_B^{\mathbb{L}} (B \hat{\otimes} Y) \cong X \hat{\otimes} (B \hat{\otimes}_B^{\mathbb{L}} B) \hat{\otimes} Y \cong X \hat{\otimes} B \hat{\otimes} Y$. Thus 35.4 follows from 35.2 as asserted.

It is also clear that 35.7 implies 35.6 and 35.6 implies 35.5. Almost the same argument that yields the implication $35.2 \implies 35.4$ also shows that 35.5 implies 35.7. Hence 35.5–7 are equivalent.

Next we claim that 35.2 and 35.5–7 are equivalent. Equation (13) yields

$$\mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_A(B, \text{Hom}(B, X)) \cong \text{Hom}(B \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} B, X),$$

$$\mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_B(B, \text{Hom}(B, X)) \cong \text{Hom}(B \hat{\otimes}_B^{\mathbb{L}} B, X),$$

for all $X \in_O \text{Ho}(\text{Bor})$. (We do not have to derive $\text{Hom}(\sqcup, X)$ because this functor is exact on extensions with a bounded linear section.) The map

$$(22) \quad i^*: \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_B(B, \text{Hom}(B, X)) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_A(B, \text{Hom}(B, X))$$

in 35.5–7 corresponds to the map induced by $i_*: B \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} B \rightarrow B \hat{\otimes}_B^{\mathbb{L}} B$ under these isomorphisms. By the Yoneda Lemma, (22) is an isomorphism for all $X \in_O \text{Ho}$ if and only if $i_*: B \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} B \rightarrow B \hat{\otimes}_B^{\mathbb{L}} B$ is an isomorphism in Ho . Hence 35.2 implies 35.5 and 35.7 implies 35.2. So far, we have seen that 35.1–7 are equivalent.

We claim that 35.6 and 35.8 are equivalent. It is clear that 35.6 implies 35.8 by applying the functor $\text{Ess}_B: \text{Der}(B^+) \rightarrow \text{Der}(B)$. Conversely, we claim that we get 35.6 back from 35.8 if we apply $\text{Rgh}_B: \text{Der}(B) \rightarrow \text{Der}(B^+)$. We have natural isomorphisms

$$\text{Rgh}_B \text{Ess}_B \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_B(B, M) \cong \text{Rgh}_B \text{Ess}_B \text{Rgh}_B M \cong \text{Rgh}_B M \cong \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_B(B, M)$$

because B is projective and $\text{Rgh}_B \circ \text{Ess}_B = \text{Rgh}_B^2 = \text{Rgh}_B$. Using adjoint associativity, we also get

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Rgh}_B \text{Ess}_B \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_A(B, M) &\cong \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_B(B, \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_A(B, M)) \\ &\cong \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_A(B \hat{\otimes}_B^{\mathbb{L}} B, M) \cong \mathbb{R} \text{Hom}_A(B, M). \end{aligned}$$

One checks easily that these isomorphisms are compatible with the maps i^* on both sides. Hence $35.6 \iff 35.8$.

It is clear that 35.7 implies 35.9 by passing to homology. For the converse, we claim that 35.8 and 35.9 are equivalent. This follows in a formal way from the adjointness of $\mathbb{R} i_*$ and i^* . It yields natural isomorphisms $\text{Der}_A(i^* X, i^* M) \cong \text{Der}_B(X, (\mathbb{R} i_*) \circ i^* M)$ for all $X, M \in_O \text{Der}(B)$. The composite

$$\text{Der}_B(X, M) \xrightarrow{i^*} \text{Der}_A(i^* X, i^* M) \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{Der}_B(X, (\mathbb{R} i_*) \circ i^* M)$$

is induced by some map $M \rightarrow (\mathbb{R} i_*) \circ i^* M$, which turns out to be the one described in 35.8. The Yoneda Lemma implies that $\text{Der}_B(X, M) \rightarrow \text{Der}_A(i^* X, i^* M)$ is an isomorphism for all X if and only if $M \rightarrow (\mathbb{R} i_*) \circ i^* M$ is an isomorphism. This means that 35.8 and 35.9 are equivalent. $\square$

Definition 36. A morphism between quasi-unital bornological algebras is called *isocohomological* if the equivalent conditions of Theorem 35 are satisfied.

Proposition 37. *Let $f: A \dashrightarrow B$ and $g: B \dashrightarrow C$ be composable morphisms between quasi-unital bornological algebras. If two of f , g , $g \circ f$ are isocohomological, so is the third.*

Proof. Suppose first that g is isocohomological. Then it follows immediately from condition 35.9 that $g \circ f$ is isocohomological if and only if f is isocohomological. Now suppose that $g \circ f$ and f are isocohomological. We want to show that g is isocohomological. Since f is isocohomological, we have $g^*(C) \hat{\otimes}_B^{\mathbb{L}} g^*(C) \cong f^* g^*(C) \hat{\otimes}_A^{\mathbb{L}} f^* g^*(C)$ by 35.4. Since $g \circ f$ is isocohomological, the latter is isomorphic to C by 35.2. This means that g is isocohomological. $\square$

Proposition 38. *Let $A_1 \dashrightarrow B_1$ and $A_2 \dashrightarrow B_2$ be isocohomological morphisms. Then the induced morphism $A_1 \hat{\otimes} A_2 \dashrightarrow B_1 \hat{\otimes} B_2$ is isocohomological as well.*

Proof. Use $(B_1 \hat{\otimes} B_2) \hat{\otimes}_{A_1 \hat{\otimes} A_2}^{\mathbb{L}} (B_1 \hat{\otimes} B_2) \cong (B_1 \hat{\otimes}_{A_1}^{\mathbb{L}} B_2) \hat{\otimes} (B_2 \hat{\otimes}_{A_2}^{\mathbb{L}} B_2)$. $\square$

6. ISOCOHOMOLOGICAL GROUP CONVOLUTION ALGEBRAS

Let $\mathcal{D}(G)$ be the convolution algebra of smooth functions of compact support on a locally compact group G . This is a quasi-unital bornological algebra, and $\mathbf{Mod}(\mathcal{D}(G))$ is isomorphic to the category $\mathbf{Mod}(G)$ of smooth representations of G (see [17]). We frequently replace $\mathcal{D}(G)$ by G in our notation, writing $\hat{\otimes}_G^{\mathbb{L}}$ and $\hat{\otimes}_G$ for $\hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{D}(G)}^{\mathbb{L}}$ and $\hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{D}(G)}$ and $\mathbb{R} \mathrm{Hom}_G$ and Hom_G for $\mathbb{R} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(G)}$ and $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{D}(G)}$.

A *smooth convolution algebra on G* is a bornological algebra $\mathcal{T}(G)$ of functions on G that contains $\mathcal{D}(G)$ as a dense subalgebra, such that the left and right regular representations of G on $\mathcal{T}(G)$ are smooth. Equivalently, $\mathcal{T}(G)$ is an essential bimodule over $\mathcal{D}(G)$. Let $i: \mathcal{D}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(G)$ be the embedding. It follows from Lemma 28 that $\mathcal{T}(G)$ is always quasi-unital and that i is a proper morphism. Proposition 31 asserts, among other things, that

$$i^* \mathrm{Ess}_{\mathcal{T}(G)} = i^* \mathrm{Ess}_{\mathcal{D}(G)}, \quad i^* \mathrm{Rgh}_{\mathcal{T}(G)} = i^* \mathrm{Rgh}_{\mathcal{D}(G)}.$$

A $\mathcal{T}(G)$ -module M is essential if and only if $i^* M$ is essential if and only if the module structure is the integrated form of a smooth representation of G ([17]).

Since i has dense range, the functor $i^*: \mathbf{Mod}(\mathcal{T}(G)) \rightarrow \mathbf{Mod}(G)$ is fully faithful, that is, $\mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}(G)}(M, N) = \mathrm{Hom}_G(M, N)$ for any $M, N \in {}_O \mathbf{Mod}(\mathcal{T}(G))$. Thus $\mathbf{Mod}(\mathcal{T}(G))$ is a full subcategory of the category $\mathbf{Mod}(G)$ of smooth representations of G . We call such representations $\mathcal{T}(G)$ -tempered. A smooth representation is $\mathcal{T}(G)$ -tempered if and only if its integrated form $\mathcal{D}(G) \rightarrow \mathrm{End}(M)$ extends to a bounded homomorphism $\mathcal{T}(G) \rightarrow \mathrm{End}(M)$.

The Schwartz algebras of Abelian locally compact groups and the Schwartz algebras of reductive groups over local fields defined by Harish-Chandra are examples of smooth convolution algebras. If G is discrete, then the smoothness condition is empty and a smooth convolution algebra is just an algebra that contains $\mathbb{C}[G]$ as a dense subalgebra. For instance, the algebra $\mathcal{S}(G)$ defined in (1) is a smooth convolution algebra on G .

Definition 39 ([18]). We call a smooth convolution algebra $\mathcal{T}(G)$ *isocohomological* if the embedding $\mathcal{D}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(G)$ is isocohomological.

Definition 40. A smooth convolution algebra $\mathcal{T}(G)$ on a locally compact group G is called *symmetric* if $U\phi(g, h) := \phi(gh, g)$ and its inverse $U^{-1}\phi(g, h) := \phi(h, h^{-1}g)$ are bounded operators on $\mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{T}(G)$.

Of course, $\mathcal{D}(G)$ is always symmetric.

Let $\mathcal{T}(G)$ be a symmetric convolution algebra and let $\mu: \mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{T}(G) \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(G)$ be the convolution. Then $(\mu \circ U)\phi(g) = \int_G \phi(g, h) dh$. Hence the trivial representation $\phi \mapsto \int_G \phi(h) dh$ is a module over $\mathcal{T}(G)$.

The convolution algebras $\mathcal{O}(G)$ and $\mathcal{S}^k(G)$ for $k \in \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{\infty, \omega\}$ defined in [19] for a finitely generated discrete group are easily seen to be symmetric. The Schwartz algebra of a locally compact Abelian group is symmetric as well because the map U is associated to a group homomorphism in this case. In contrast, the Harish-Chandra-Schwartz algebra of a reductive group over a local field cannot be symmetric because the trivial representation of such a group is not tempered. For the same reason, the Jolissaint algebra of a discrete group with rapid decay is only symmetric for groups of polynomial growth.

Proposition 41. *A symmetric convolution algebra $\mathcal{T}(G)$ is isocohomological if and only if $\mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes}_G^{\mathbb{L}} \mathbb{C} \cong \mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{T}(G)}^{\mathbb{L}} \mathbb{C} \cong \mathbb{C}$. By definition, $\mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes}_G^{\mathbb{L}} \mathbb{C} \cong \mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes}_G P_\bullet$ for any projective resolution $P_\bullet \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ of the trivial representation of G .*

Proof. For $M \in {}_O \text{Mod}(G^{\text{op}})$, $N \in {}_O \text{Mod}(G)$, equip $M \hat{\otimes} N$ with the inner conjugation action $(m \otimes n) \cdot g := (m \cdot g \otimes g^{-1} \cdot n)$ for all $g \in G$, $m \in M$, $n \in N$, and the associated right $\mathcal{D}(G)$ -module structure. Then we have a natural isomorphism $M \hat{\otimes}_G N \cong (M \otimes N) \hat{\otimes}_G \mathbb{C}$ (see [17]). This easily implies the corresponding statement for chain complexes M and N . It is checked in [17] that $M \hat{\otimes} N$ is a projective $\mathcal{D}(G)$ -module if M or N is projective. Hence

$$M \hat{\otimes}_G^{\mathbb{L}} N \cong (M \hat{\otimes} N) \hat{\otimes}_G^{\mathbb{L}} \mathbb{C}$$

for all $M \in {}_O \text{Der}(G^{\text{op}})$, $N \in {}_O \text{Der}(G)$. In particular,

$$\mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes}_G^{\mathbb{L}} \mathcal{T}(G) \cong (\mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{T}(G))^{\rho \hat{\otimes} \lambda} \hat{\otimes}_G^{\mathbb{L}} \mathbb{C},$$

where the superscript $\rho \hat{\otimes} \lambda$ indicates that we equip $\mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{T}(G)$ with the inner conjugation representation of G .

The operator U of Definition 40 intertwines the inner conjugation action $\rho \hat{\otimes} \lambda$ and the regular representation on the second tensor factor $1 \hat{\otimes} \rho$. Hence

$$(\mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{T}(G))^{\rho \hat{\otimes} \lambda} \cong (\mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{T}(G))^{1 \hat{\otimes} \rho}$$

for symmetric convolution algebras. Therefore,

$$\mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes}_G^{\mathbb{L}} \mathcal{T}(G) \cong (\mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{T}(G))^{1 \hat{\otimes} \rho} \hat{\otimes}_G^{\mathbb{L}} \mathbb{C} \cong \mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes} (\mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes}_G^{\mathbb{L}} \mathbb{C}).$$

This implies the assertion. $\square$

Theorem 42. *Let G be a finitely generated discrete group. If G admits a combing of polynomial growth, then $\mathcal{S}(G)$ is isocohomological; if G admits a combing of subexponential growth, then $\mathcal{S}^\omega(G)$ is isocohomological; and if G admits a combing of exponential growth, then $\mathcal{O}(G)$ is isocohomological.*

In general, if $\mathcal{T}(G)$ is $\mathcal{O}(G)$, $\mathcal{S}^\omega(G)$, or $\mathcal{S}(G)$, then $\mathcal{T}(G)$ is isocohomological if and only if the chain complex that is denoted by $\mathcal{TC}_\bullet(G)$ in [19] has a bounded contracting homotopy. This property is invariant under quasi-isometry.

Proof. Let G be a finitely generated discrete group and let $\mathcal{T}(G)$ be one of the convolution algebras $\mathcal{O}(G)$ and $\mathcal{S}^k(G)$ for $k \in \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{\infty, \omega\}$. It is easy to see that $\mathcal{T}(G)$ is symmetric. For an appropriate choice of resolution $P_\bullet$, the complex $\mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes}_G P_\bullet$ is exactly the complex that is denoted by $\mathcal{TC}_\bullet(G)$ in [19]. Proposition 41 therefore yields that $\mathcal{T}(G)$ is isocohomological if and only if the chain complex $\mathcal{TC}_\bullet(G)$ is contractible. It is shown in [19] that this condition is invariant under quasi-isometry and is satisfied in the presence of suitable combings. $\square$

In particular, the above theorem applies to finitely generated free non-Abelian groups, to hyperbolic groups, to automatic groups, and to finitely generated Abelian groups. All these classes of groups have combings of linear growth. The following is proven in [18]:

Theorem 43. *The Bruhat-Schwartz algebra $\mathcal{S}(G)$ is isocohomological for any Abelian locally compact group G .*

A *weight function* on G is a function $w: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ such that $w(gh) \leq w(g)w(h)$ for all $g, h \in G$. We do not require any relationship between $w(g)$ and $w(g^{-1})$. If w is a weight function, then

$$\ell_1(G, w) := \left\{ f: G \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \mid \sum_{g \in G} |f(g)|w(g) < \infty \right\}$$

is a Banach algebra with respect to convolution. The functions $w(g) \cdot (\ell(g) + 1)^k$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $w(g) \cdot \alpha^{\ell(g)}$ for $\alpha > 1$ are also weight functions if w is. We let

$$\mathcal{S}(G, w) := \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_1(G, w \cdot (\ell + 1)^k).$$

A subset of $\mathcal{S}(G, w)$ is bounded if and only if it is bounded in $\ell_1(G, w \cdot (\ell + 1)^k)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus $\mathcal{S}(G, w)$ is a Fréchet-Schwartz space. More generally, if W is a set of weight functions, we let

$$\mathcal{S}(G, W) := \bigcap_{w \in W} \mathcal{S}(G, w).$$

A subset of $\mathcal{S}(G, W)$ is bounded if it is bounded in $\mathcal{S}(G, w)$ for all $w \in W$. If W is countable, then $\mathcal{S}(G, w)$ is a Fréchet-Schwartz space. For instance, if $W = \{n^\ell \mid n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 2}\}$, then $\mathcal{S}(G, W) = \mathcal{O}(G)$ because the exponential growth of $(n + 1)^\ell / n^\ell$ dominates the polynomial growth of $(\ell + 1)^k$. The convolution algebras $\mathcal{S}(G, W)$ are usually not symmetric. Nevertheless, we can treat them as in [19].

Definition 44. Let G be a discrete group and let $f_j: G \rightarrow G$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, be a combing of G as defined in [19]. A set of weights W is called *compatible* with the combing if it has the following property: for any $w \in W$ there is a finite linear combination $\bar{w} := \sum_{w \in W} \alpha_w w$ such that

$$w(f_j(g)) \cdot w(f_j(g)^{-1}h) \leq \bar{w}(g) \cdot \bar{w}(g^{-1}h)$$

for all $g, h \in G$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Theorem 45. *Let G be a discrete group and let $(f_j)_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a combing of G of polynomial growth. Let W be a set of weight functions on G that is compatible with the combing. Then $\mathcal{S}(G, W)$ is isocohomological.*

Proof. The proof is very similar to the proof of the corresponding statement without weights in [19]. Hence we only outline the necessary changes and assume that the reader is familiar with [19].

Let $V := \mathcal{S}(G, W) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{S}(G, W)$ equipped with the inner conjugation action. We have to show that the natural chain map $V \hat{\otimes}_G^{\mathbb{L}} \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(G, W)$ is an isomorphism in $\mathbf{Ho}$. The operator U in Definition 40 is a bornological isomorphism between V and

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{V} := \{ f: G \times G \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \mid \\ \sum_{g, h \in G} |f(g, h)|w(h)w(h^{-1}g)(\ell(g) + \ell(h) + 1)^k < \infty \forall w \in W, k \in \mathbb{N} \}. \end{aligned}$$

The isomorphism is equivariant for the regular representation $f \cdot g(x, y) := f(x, y \cdot g)$ on $\tilde{V}$. The free chain complex $C_\bullet(G)$ can be viewed as a free $\mathbb{C}[G]$ -module resolution

of $\mathbb{C}$. Hence $V \hat{\otimes}_G^{\mathbb{L}} \mathbb{C} \cong V \hat{\otimes}_G C_{\bullet}(G)$. We identify $V \hat{\otimes}_G C_n(G)$ with the space of functions $f: G \times G^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ that satisfy the control condition in the definition of $SC_{\bullet}(G)$ in [19] with respect to the last $n+1$ variables and for which the function $(g, h) \mapsto f(g, h \cdot x)$ belongs to $\tilde{V}$ for all $x \in G^{n+1}$. A subset of $V \hat{\otimes}_G C_n(G)$ is bounded if it satisfies the control condition uniformly and if the set of functions $(g, h) \mapsto f(g, h \cdot x)$ is bounded in $\tilde{V}$ for any fixed $x \in G^{n+1}$. The boundary map on $V \hat{\otimes}_G C_{\bullet}(G)$ is $\text{id} \otimes \delta$.

We have $V \hat{\otimes}_G C_0(G) = \tilde{V}$. The multiplication map $V \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(G, W)$ corresponds to the map $\alpha: \tilde{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(G, W)$, $\alpha f(g) = \sum_h f(g, h)$. The map α is split surjective. Let $K_{\bullet}$ be the complex with $K_n = V \hat{\otimes}_G C_n(G)$ for $n \geq 1$ and $K_0 = \ker \alpha$. Instead of showing that α is a homotopy equivalence, we may show that $K_{\bullet}$ is contractible. Let $H: \tilde{C}_{\bullet}(G) \rightarrow \tilde{C}_{\bullet}(G)$ be the contracting homotopy that is used in the proof of [19, Theorem 4]. Then $\text{id} \otimes H$ is a contracting homotopy for the dense subcomplex of compactly supported functions in $K_{\bullet}$. As in [19], one checks that this extends to a bounded contracting homotopy for $K_{\bullet}$. The compatibility between the set of weights and the combing is exactly what is needed to prove that $\text{id} \otimes H$ is bounded with respect to the growth condition that defines $\tilde{V}$. $\square$

Example 46. If $w: G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ is a group homomorphism, then

$$w(f_j(g)) \cdot w(f_j(g)^{-1}h) = w(h) = w(g) \cdot w(g^{-1}h),$$

no matter what combing we use. Hence the compatibility is automatic if W is a set of group homomorphisms. For instance, let $G = \mathbb{Z}^n$. This group has a well-known combing of linear growth. It is defined by approximating the straight line in $\mathbb{R}^n$ by a path in $\mathbb{Z}^n$. Group homomorphisms $G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ are of the form $x \mapsto \exp(a \cdot x)$ for some $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Hence any subset $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ defines a weighted Schwartz algebra $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{Z}^n, W)$. All these convolution algebras are isocohomological by Theorem 45.

By the way, $\max\{\exp(a \cdot x), \exp(b \cdot x)\}$ dominates $\exp(c \cdot x)$ if c is a convex combination of a and b . Therefore, $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{Z}^n, W) = \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{Z}^n, \bar{W})$ if $\bar{W}$ is the convex hull of W . Thus it suffices to consider the algebras $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{Z}^n, W)$ for convex $W \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$. Any such convex subset is a union of an increasing sequence of convex polyhedra. This implies that $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{Z}^n, W)$ is always a Fréchet-Schwartz algebra.

Example 47. Let $\mathbb{F}_r$ be the free group on r generators $s_1, \dots, s_r$. This group has the rapid decay property of Paul Jolissaint ([10]). This means that

$$\mathcal{S}_2(\mathbb{F}_r) := \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell^2(\mathbb{F}_r, (\ell + 1)^k)$$

is an algebra with respect to convolution. Using the standard free $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{F}_r]$ -resolution of the trivial representation of length 1, we identify $(\mathcal{S}_2(\mathbb{F}_r) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{S}_2(\mathbb{F}_r))^{\rho \hat{\otimes} \lambda} \hat{\otimes}_{\mathbb{F}_r}^{\mathbb{L}} \mathbb{C}$ with the complex $(\mathcal{S}_2(\mathbb{F}_r) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{S}_2(\mathbb{F}_r))^r \xrightarrow{\delta} \mathcal{S}_2(\mathbb{F}_r) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{S}_2(\mathbb{F}_r)$ of length 1, where

$$\delta((x_j \otimes y_j)) := \sum_{j=1}^r x_j \otimes y_j - x_j s_j^{-1} \otimes s_j y_j.$$

One can show that δ is not an isomorphism onto the kernel of the multiplication map $\mathcal{S}_2(\mathbb{F}_r) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{S}_2(\mathbb{F}_r) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_2(\mathbb{F}_r)$. This means that $\mathcal{S}_2(\mathbb{F}_r)$ is *not* isocohomological.

6.1. Variants of the de Rham complex. The complexes that we introduce in this section are used to prove that certain convolution algebras are isocohomological.

Let M be a smooth oriented manifold of dimension n . We will only use the case $M = \mathbb{R}^n$ later. However, since we equip $\mathbb{R}^n$ with group actions and want to do constructions equivariantly, it is useful to formulate some definitions more generally. Let $T^*M \rightarrow M$ be the cotangent bundle of M and let $\Lambda^*(M) \rightarrow M$ be its exterior

algebra bundle. This is a graded algebra. Let $\Omega(M)$ be the space of smooth sections of Λ^*M , equipped with its usual Fréchet topology and the precompact bornology that it defines. The de Rham boundary d^{dR} turns $\Omega(M)$ into a bornological chain complex, whose homology is known as the de Rham cohomology of M .

Let $\mathcal{D}\Omega(M) \subseteq \Omega(M)$ be the subspace of compactly supported smooth sections. A subset of $\mathcal{D}\Omega(M)$ is bounded if it is bounded in $\Omega(M)$ and all its elements have uniformly compact support. The orientation of M provides a bounded linear functional $f: \mathcal{D}\Omega^n(M) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ that satisfies $f \circ d^{\text{dR}} = 0$. Hence we get a chain complex

$$(23) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}\Omega^0(M) \xrightarrow{d^{\text{dR}}} \mathcal{D}\Omega^1(M) \xrightarrow{d^{\text{dR}}} \dots \xrightarrow{d^{\text{dR}}} \mathcal{D}\Omega^n(M) \xrightarrow{f} \mathbb{C}.$$

This chain complex is natural for orientation preserving diffeomorphisms. If a diffeomorphism $\Phi: M \rightarrow M$ reverses the orientation, we let it act on $\mathcal{D}\Omega^j(M)$ by $\omega \mapsto -\Phi^*\omega$ for all j . Thus f and d^{dR} commute with the action of Φ . Thus (23) becomes a chain complex over $\text{Mod}(G)$ if G is a Lie group that acts smoothly on M . We equip $\mathbb{C}$ with the trivial representation of G . Since we want (23) to be a resolution, we shift the grading so that $\mathcal{D}\Omega^n(M)$ occurs in degree $n - j$.

Proposition 48. *Suppose that a Lie group G (possibly with infinitely many components) acts properly and smoothly on $\mathbb{R}^n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the chain complex (23) for $M = \mathbb{R}^n$ is a projective resolution of the trivial representation of G .*

Proof. We have to check that $\mathcal{D}\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is a projective $\mathcal{D}(G)$ -module and that the complex (23) for $M = \mathbb{R}^n$ has a bounded contracting homotopy. The second assertion is well-known. Using the isomorphism $\mathcal{D}\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n) \cong \mathcal{D}\Omega(\mathbb{R})^{\hat{\otimes} n}$, we can reduce the proof to the easy case $n = 1$. To prove projectivity of $\mathcal{D}\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n)$, we need a G -equivariant section for the map

$$\alpha: \mathcal{D}(G \times M, \Lambda^*M) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{D}(G) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{D}\Omega(M) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}\Omega(M)$$

that defines the group action. There is $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(M)$ with $\int_G \psi(g^{-1}x) d\lambda(g) = 1$ for all $x \in M$. The map $\sigma f(g, x) := \psi(x) \cdot g_*^{-1}f(gx)$ is the desired section for α . $\square$

Next we describe variants $\mathcal{S}\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\mathcal{S}^\omega\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n)$, and $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ of (23) for $M = \mathbb{R}^n$. We let $\mathcal{S}\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n)$ be the space of all sections of $\Lambda^*\mathbb{R}^n$ with rapid decay; that is, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and all constant coefficient differential operators D on $\mathbb{R}^n$, there is $C > 0$ with $\|D(f)(x)\| \leq C \cdot (\|x\| + 1)^{-k}$. Here we use the usual Euclidean metric on $\mathbb{R}^n$ to define the norm on the fibres of $\Lambda^*\mathbb{R}^n$. A subset of $\mathcal{S}\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n)$ is bounded if the above estimates hold uniformly for its elements. The operators d^{dR} and f extend to $\mathcal{S}\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n)$, so that $\mathcal{S}\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n)$ becomes a chain complex of bornological vector spaces.

Similarly, we define $\mathcal{O}\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by requiring exponential decay, that is, for all $\alpha > 1$ and all constant coefficient differential operators D on $\mathbb{R}^n$, there is $C > 0$ such that $\|D(f)(x)\| \leq C \cdot \alpha^{\|x\|}$. Finally, we define $\mathcal{S}^\omega\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n)$ by a subexponential decay condition: there is $\alpha > 1$ such that for all constant coefficient differential operators D on $\mathbb{R}^n$ there is $C > 0$ with $\|D(f)(x)\| \leq C \cdot \alpha^{\|x\|}$. In both cases, we call a subset bounded if its elements satisfy the appropriate estimate uniformly.

Lemma 49. *The complexes $\mathcal{S}\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n)$, $\mathcal{S}^\omega\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\mathcal{O}\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (all augmented by f) are contractible.*

Proof. One checks easily that $\mathcal{S}\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n) \cong \mathcal{S}\Omega(\mathbb{R})^{\hat{\otimes} n}$. Hence the assertion for general n reduces to the special case $n = 1$, which is easy. The same argument works for $\mathcal{S}^\omega\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\mathcal{O}\Omega(\mathbb{R}^n)$. $\square$

6.2. Application to groups of polynomial growth. Let G be a discrete group of polynomial growth. That is, G is finitely generated and the number of elements $g \in G$ satisfying $\ell(g) \leq R$ has polynomial growth as a function of R . This section is devoted to the proof of the following theorem:

Theorem 50. *Let G be a discrete group of polynomial growth. Then the convolution algebras $\mathcal{S}(G)$, $\mathcal{S}^\omega(G)$ and $\mathcal{O}(G)$ on G are isocohomological.*

Let $\mathcal{T}(G)$ be one of the convolution algebras in the statement of the theorem. We shall use the following known structure theorem:

Theorem 51. *Let G be a finitely generated discrete group of polynomial growth. Then there exists a connected nilpotent Lie group $\bar{G}$ and a cocompact lattice $G' \subseteq \bar{G}$ that is quasi-isometric to G .*

Proof. By a celebrated result of Mikhail Gromov ([5]), the group G contains a nilpotent subgroup G_1 of finite index. It follows from results of [7] that G_1 and hence G contain a torsion free subgroup G' of finite index, which is, of course, again finitely generated and nilpotent. A famous result of Anatoliĭ Ivanovič Malcev ([14, 15]) yields that G' is isomorphic to a cocompact lattice in a connected nilpotent Lie group. $\square$

It follows from [19] that the assertions in Theorem 50 are invariant under quasi-isometry. Hence we may assume in the following that G is a cocompact lattice in a connected nilpotent Lie group $\bar{G}$. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be the Lie algebra of $\bar{G}$. Since $\bar{G}$ is nilpotent, the exponential map $\exp: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \bar{G}$ is a diffeomorphism, that is, its inverse $\log: \bar{G} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ is everywhere defined and smooth. In the following, we identify $\bar{G} \cong \mathfrak{g} \cong \mathbb{R}^n$ and equip $\mathfrak{g}$ with the action of G by left translation. This is a smooth action $G \times \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$ as in Proposition 48. Hence the complex $\mathcal{D}\Omega(\bar{G})$ is a projective resolution of the trivial representation of G .

Lemma 52. $\mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes}_G \mathcal{D}\Omega(\bar{G}) \cong \mathcal{T}\Omega(\mathfrak{g})$ as bornological chain complexes.

Lemma 52 and Lemma 49 yield $\mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes}_G^{\mathbb{L}} \mathbb{C} \cong \mathbb{C}$. Since $\mathcal{T}(G)$ is a symmetric convolution algebra, this implies that $\mathcal{T}(G)$ is isocohomological and finishes the proof of Theorem 51.

Proof. Let $X_1, \dots, X_n$ be an orthonormal basis for $\mathfrak{g}$. We view $X_1, \dots, X_n$ as left invariant vector fields on $\bar{G}$ and then pull them back to $\mathfrak{g}$ using the exponential map. We still write $X_1, \dots, X_n$ for the resulting vector fields on $\mathfrak{g}$. Alternatively, we may also extend $X_1, \dots, X_n$ to translation invariant vector fields on the Euclidean space $\mathfrak{g}$. We denote these by $Y_1, \dots, Y_n$. Since they are both $\mathcal{D}(\mathfrak{g})$ -module bases for the space of vector fields on $\mathfrak{g}$, they are related by pointwise multiplication with some function $\mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \text{Gl}(\mathfrak{g})$. This function can be described as follows. Let $\text{ad}: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \text{End}(\mathfrak{g})$ be the adjoint representation of $\mathfrak{g}$. We need the holomorphic function

$$\sigma: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad \sigma(x) := \frac{\sinh(x/2)}{x/2}.$$

It is shown in [21] and [2] that $Y_j(Z)$ is obtained from $X_j(Z)$ by applying the linear operator $\sigma(\text{ad}(Z))$ for all $Z \in \mathfrak{g}$. Since $\bar{G}$ is nilpotent, the function $\sigma(\text{ad}(Z))$ and its inverse $\sigma(\text{ad}(Z))^{-1}$ are both polynomial functions on $\mathfrak{g}$. Therefore, if $\phi \in \mathcal{E}(\mathfrak{g})$, then $P(X_1, \dots, X_n)(\phi)$ has rapid decay for all polynomials P if and only if $P(Y_1, \dots, Y_n)(\phi)$ has rapid decay for all polynomials P .

Equip $\bar{G}$ with some Riemannian metric that is invariant under left multiplication and let $d: \bar{G} \times \bar{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be the associated metric. It is well-known that the curves $\exp(tX)$ for $X \in \mathfrak{g}$ with $\|X\| = 1$ are unit speed geodesics in $\bar{G}$. Thus $d(x, 1) =$

$\|\log(x)\|$ for all $x \in \bar{G}$. Since $G \subseteq \bar{G}$ is cocompact, the word length function on G is equivalent to the length function $\|\log(x)\|$, so that both norms give the same rapid decay condition. This allows to identify $\mathcal{S}(G) \hat{\otimes}_G \mathcal{D}(\mathfrak{g})$ with the space of functions $\mathfrak{g} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ for which $P(X_1, \dots, X_n)(\phi)$ has rapid decay for all polynomials P . Since we may replace (X_j) by (Y_j) , this gives $\mathcal{S}(\mathfrak{g})$ as desired. The same argument works for $\mathcal{S}^\omega(\bar{G})$ and $\mathcal{O}(\bar{G})$.

Let $dX_1, \dots, dX_n$ be the basis for the space of covector fields that is dual to $X_1, \dots, X_n$. Then the standard basis vectors $dX_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dX_{i_j}$ for $\Lambda^* \mathfrak{g}$ provide a $\bar{G}$ -invariant basis for the space of differential forms on $\mathfrak{g}$. This yields a $\bar{G}$ -equivariant isomorphism $\mathcal{D}(\bar{G}) \hat{\otimes} \Lambda^* \mathfrak{g} \cong \mathcal{D}\Omega(\bar{G})$ and hence $\mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes}_G \mathcal{D}\Omega(\bar{G}) \cong \mathcal{T}(\mathfrak{g}) \hat{\otimes} \Lambda^* \mathfrak{g}$. Here we use the differential forms $dX_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dX_{i_j}$ as our basis to measure the decay of a differential form. Since we get the same decay condition if we use $dY_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dY_{i_j}$ instead, this space is equal to $\mathcal{T}\Omega(\mathfrak{g})$ as desired. $\square$

6.3. Some smooth convolution algebras on Lie groups. The techniques used to prove Theorem 51 also apply to certain smooth convolution algebras on Lie groups. First we define the convolution algebras that we are interested in. Let G be a Lie group with finitely many connected components. (More generally, similar constructions work for arbitrary almost connected locally compact groups). Let $d\lambda$ be a left invariant Haar measure on G . We need the following analogue of a word length function. There is a compact subset $S \subseteq G$ with $S = S^{-1}$ and $\bigcup S^n = G$. Define $\ell(g)$ to be the minimal $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $g \in S^n$. It is easy to see that the norms

$$\|\phi\|^k := \int_G |\phi(g)| (\ell(g) + 1)^k d\lambda(g), \quad \|\phi\|_\alpha := \int_G |\phi(g)| \alpha^{\ell(g)} d\lambda(g)$$

are submultiplicative and hence define Banach convolution algebras $\ell_1(G, (\ell + 1)^k)$ and $\ell_1(G, \alpha^\ell)$ on G .

Consider the space $A(G) := \bigcap_{\alpha > 1} \ell_1(G, \alpha^\ell)$ of functions of exponential decay, equipped with the obvious bornology. This is the von Neumann bornology on a Fréchet space. We let $\mathcal{O}(G)$ be the smoothening of the left regular representation of G on $A(G)$. Let $U(\mathfrak{g})$ be the universal enveloping algebra of G , identified with the space of distributions on G supported at the identity element. Since $A(G)$ is bornologically metrisable, the smoothening $\mathcal{O}(G)$ is the subspace of $\phi \in A(G)$ for which $D * \phi \in A(G)$ for all $D \in U(\mathfrak{g})$. A subset S of $A(G)$ is bounded if and only if $D * S$ is bounded in $A(G)$ for each $D \in U(\mathfrak{g})$ (see [17]). If G is only almost connected, the smoothening is a bit more complicated to describe explicitly. We assume in the following that G is a Lie group to simplify the exposition.

We claim that $\mathcal{O}(G)$ is a symmetric smooth convolution algebra on G . It is clear that the left regular representation of G on $\mathcal{O}(G)$ is smooth. The difference between left and right convolution by D is given by the adjoint representation of G on $\mathfrak{g}$. Since this has at most exponential growth, the operator $\phi \mapsto \phi * D$ is a bounded linear operator on $\mathcal{O}(G)$ for any $D \in U(\mathfrak{g})$. This means that the right regular representation of G on $\mathcal{O}(G)$ is smooth as well. Thus $\mathcal{O}(G)$ is a smooth convolution algebra on G . Of course, we could equally well have defined $\mathcal{O}(G)$ as the smoothening of the right regular representation. Since it does not matter on which side we smoothen the representation, the same argument as in the discrete case shows that $\mathcal{O}(G)$ is symmetric.

Now suppose that G is a connected nilpotent Lie group or, slightly more generally, an extension of a compact group by a connected nilpotent Lie group. Let $B(G) := \bigcap_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \ell_1(G, (\ell + 1)^k)$ and let $\mathcal{S}(G)$ be the smoothening of the left regular representation of G on $B(G)$. This space can be described as above. Since the adjoint representation of G has polynomial growth in this case, the right and left regular representations of G on $\mathcal{S}(G)$ have the same smoothening. The same

reasoning as above shows that $\mathcal{S}(G)$ is a symmetric smooth convolution algebra on G . Finally, we define $B^\omega(G) := \bigcup_{\alpha > 1} \ell_1(G, \alpha^\ell)$ and let $\mathcal{S}^\omega(G)$ be the smoothening of the left regular representation on this space. This is a symmetric smooth convolution algebra for the same reasons.

We remark without proof that the smoothening of $\bigcap \ell_p(G, \alpha^\ell)$ is equal to $\mathcal{O}(G)$ for all $p \in [1, \infty]$ and for all almost connected locally compact groups. Similarly, in the nilpotent case the smoothenings of $\bigcap \ell_p(G, (\ell + 1)^k)$ and $\bigcup \ell_p(G, \alpha^\ell)$ are equal to $\mathcal{S}(G)$ and $\mathcal{S}^\omega(G)$, respectively, for all $p \in [1, \infty]$. This implies that the spaces $\mathcal{O}(G)$, $\mathcal{S}(G)$, and $\mathcal{S}^\omega(G)$ are nuclear whenever they are defined. We do not prove this statement because we have no use for it here.

Theorem 53. *The convolution algebras $\mathcal{S}(G)$, $\mathcal{S}^\omega(G)$ and $\mathcal{O}(G)$ are isocohomological if G is a connected nilpotent Lie group.*

Proof. We have already remarked above that these convolution algebras are symmetric. The complex $\mathcal{D}\Omega(G)$ is a projective resolution of the trivial representation of G by Proposition 48. As in the proof of Lemma 52, one shows that $\mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes}_G \mathcal{D}\Omega(G) \cong \mathcal{T}\Omega(\mathfrak{g})$. This yields the assertion as above. $\square$

Let G be a Lie group with finitely many connected components and let $K \subseteq G$ be a maximal compact subgroup. The general structure theory of such groups asserts that G/K is diffeomorphic to some $\mathbb{R}^n$. Hence $\mathcal{D}\Omega(G/K) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a projective $\mathcal{D}(G)$ -module resolution of the trivial representation of G by Proposition 48. We choose a K -invariant inner product on the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of G . This defines a G -invariant Riemannian metric on G/K . Let $\mathfrak{p}$ be the orthogonal complement of the Lie algebra of K inside $\mathfrak{g}$. We may identify $\mathfrak{p}$ with the tangent space of G/K at the identity coset K . As above, unit speed geodesics in G/K emanating from K are exactly the paths of the form $\exp(tX)$ for some $X \in \mathfrak{p}$ with $\|X\| = 1$.

Theorem 54. *Suppose that the map $\exp: \mathfrak{p} \rightarrow G/K$ described above is a diffeomorphism. For instance, this is the case if $\mathfrak{g}$ is a reductive Lie algebra and G and its centre have only finitely many connected components, or if G is an exponential Lie group. Then $\mathcal{O}(G)$ is isocohomological.*

Proof. It is well-known that the homogeneous space G/K is a CAT(0) space if $\mathfrak{g}$ is reductive and G and its centre have only finitely many connected components. This implies that the exponential map is a diffeomorphism (see [2]). Recall that G is exponential if $\exp: \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow G$ is a diffeomorphism. This implies $K = \{1\}$ and hence that the map $\exp: \mathfrak{p} \rightarrow G/K$ is a diffeomorphism.

Since the exponential map $\mathfrak{p} \rightarrow G/K$ is a diffeomorphism, it yields an isomorphism $\mathcal{D}\Omega(G/K) \cong \mathcal{D}\Omega(\mathfrak{p})$. As above, the proof is finished by showing that this extends to an isomorphism between $\mathcal{O}(G) \hat{\otimes}_G \mathcal{D}\Omega(G/K)$ and $\mathcal{O}\Omega(\mathfrak{p})$. If $K = \{1\}$, that is, G is an exponential Lie group, then the argument is almost literally the same as above. The function $\sigma(\text{ad } Z)$ above and its inverse automatically have exponential growth. This is enough to prove that the different bases (X_j) and (Y_j) are equivalent for measuring the decay of derivatives, as long as we are only interested in spaces like $\mathcal{O}(G)$ which are closed under multiplication by functions of exponential growth.

In general, we may proceed as follows. The projection $G \rightarrow G/K$ induces a map $\Omega(G/K) \rightarrow \Omega(G)$. We call a differential form $\omega \in \Omega(G)$ *special* if it is in the range of this map. Equivalently, it is invariant under the right regular representation of K and takes values in $\Lambda^*\mathfrak{p} \subseteq \Lambda^*\mathfrak{g}$. Let $X_1, \dots, X_m$ be a basis of $\mathfrak{g}$ and view these elements as left invariant vector fields on G . We let $\mathcal{O}\Omega(G)$ be the space of all sections of $\Omega(G)$ whose coefficients with respect to the basis $dX_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge dX_{i_j}$ are in $\mathcal{O}(G)$. Recall also that $f \in \mathcal{O}(G)$ if and only if $P(X_1, \dots, X_m)(f) = O(\alpha^\ell)$

for all $\alpha > 1$ and all polynomials P . One can now check that $\mathcal{O}(G) \hat{\otimes}_G \mathcal{D}\Omega(G/K)$ is isomorphic to the closed subspace of special forms in $\mathcal{O}\Omega(G)$.

We may view $\mathfrak{g} \times K$ as a Lie group and then define $\mathcal{O}\Omega(\mathfrak{g} \times K)$ and the subspace of special differential forms as above. Explicitly, special differential forms on $\mathfrak{g} \times K$ are defined using the coordinate projection $\mathfrak{g} \times K \rightarrow \mathfrak{g}$. We use the length function $\ell(X, k) := \|X\|$ on $\mathfrak{p} \times K$ and the basis $Y_1, \dots, Y_m$ of $\mathfrak{g} \times K$ -invariant vector fields associated to the basis (X_j) of $\mathfrak{g}$. One can show easily that $\mathcal{O}\Omega(\mathfrak{p})$ is isomorphic to the subspace of special differential forms in $\mathcal{O}\Omega(\mathfrak{g} \times K)$.

The hypotheses on G guarantee that the map

$$\Theta: \mathfrak{p} \times K \rightarrow G, \quad (X, k) \mapsto \exp(X) \cdot k,$$

is a diffeomorphism. If $\omega \in \Omega(G)$, then ω is special if and only if $\Theta^*(\omega)$ is special. The function $\ell \circ \Theta^{-1}$ on G is equivalent to the length function that is used to define $\mathcal{O}(G)$. The bases (X_j) and (Y_j) are related by multiplication by functions of at most exponential growth. Therefore, $\mathcal{O}\Omega(G) \cong \mathcal{O}\Omega(\mathfrak{g} \times K)$, and the subspaces of special elements also coincide. This means that $\mathcal{O}(G) \hat{\otimes}_G \mathcal{D}\Omega(G/K) \cong \mathcal{O}\Omega(\mathfrak{p})$ as asserted. $\square$

7. TEMPERED CROSSED PRODUCTS AND NONCOMMUTATIVE TORI

In this section, we consider crossed product algebras. First we define them, show that they are quasi-unital, and identify the essential modules with covariant representations. Then we find a sufficient criterion for isocohomological embeddings in this context and apply it to noncommutative tori.

7.1. Crossed product algebras with compact support. Let G be a locally compact group and let B be a bornological algebra equipped with a smooth representation of G by algebra automorphisms $\beta: G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(B)$. The space $\mathcal{D}(G, B)$ of smooth compactly supported functions $G \rightarrow B$ can be defined most quickly as $\mathcal{D}(G) \hat{\otimes} B$ (see also [17]). Let $d\lambda$ be a left invariant Haar measure on G . We define the convolution on $\mathcal{D}(G, B)$ by the usual formula

$$(24) \quad \phi_1 * \phi_2(g) := \int_G \phi_1(h) \cdot \beta_h \phi_2(h^{-1}g) d\lambda(h).$$

for all $\phi_1, \phi_2 \in \mathcal{D}(G, B)$. This multiplication turns $\mathcal{D}(G, B)$ into a bornological algebra, which we denote $\mathcal{D}(G) \rtimes B$.

Definition 55. Suppose that B is essential. An (essential) *covariant representation of G and B* on a bornological vector space M is a pair (ρ, π) , where $\rho: B \rightarrow \text{End}(M)$ is an essential B -module structure on M and $\pi: G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(M)$ is a smooth representation, such that $\pi(g)\rho(b)\pi(g^{-1}) = \rho(\beta_g b)$ for all $g \in G$, $b \in B$.

A covariant representation can be integrated to a module structure

$$\mathcal{D}(G) \rtimes B \rightarrow \text{End}(M), \quad \phi \mapsto \int_G \rho(\phi(g)) \circ \pi(g) d\lambda(g).$$

We want to show that all essential modules over $\mathcal{D}(G) \rtimes B$ are of this form. As in the theory of C^* -algebra crossed products, this is done by embedding B and G in the multiplier algebra $\mathcal{M}(\mathcal{D}(G) \rtimes B)$ by

$$\begin{aligned} (g \cdot \phi)(h) &:= \beta_g \phi(g^{-1}h), & (b \cdot \phi)(h) &:= b\phi(h), \\ (\phi \cdot g)(h) &:= \phi(hg^{-1})\mu_G(g)^{-1}, & (\phi \cdot b)(h) &:= \phi(h)\beta_h(b), \end{aligned}$$

where μ_G denotes the modular function of G . The representations of G on $\mathcal{D}(G) \rtimes B$ by left and right multiplication are evidently smooth, that is, $\mathcal{D}(G) \rtimes B$ is an essential bimodule over $\mathcal{D}(G)$. If B is quasi-unital, then $\mathcal{D}(G) \rtimes B$ is also an

essential B -bimodule. This is clear for the left module structure. For the right module structure, use the bounded linear operators $W, W^{-1}: \mathcal{D}(G, B) \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(G, B)$,

$$(25) \quad W\phi(g) := \beta_g\phi(g), \quad W^{-1}\phi(g) := \beta_g^{-1}\phi(g).$$

They satisfy $W^{-1}(W(\phi) \cdot b)(h) = \phi(h)b$. Hence $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B \cong \mathcal{D}(G) \hat{\otimes} B$ with the free module structure both as a left and a right B -module.

Theorem 56. *If B is quasi-unital, then $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B$ is quasi-unital as well. The category of essential $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B$ -modules is equivalent to the category of covariant representations of G and B .*

Proof. It is straightforward to construct approximate units in $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B$ using approximate units in B and an approximation of δ_1 in $\mathcal{D}(G)$ (see also [17] for a treatment of $\mathcal{D}(G)$). Let (ρ, π) be a covariant representation of G and B on M . Since $\rho: B \rightarrow \text{End}(M)$ is essential, we have a bounded linear section $\sigma_{BM}: M \rightarrow B \hat{\otimes} M$. Define $\sigma: M \rightarrow \mathcal{D}(G, B \hat{\otimes} M) \cong (\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B) \hat{\otimes} M$ by

$$\sigma(m)(g) := \psi(g) \cdot (\text{id}_B \hat{\otimes} \pi)(g)^{-1} \sigma_{BM}(m)$$

for some function $\psi \in \mathcal{D}(G)$ with $\int_G \psi(g) d\lambda(g) = 1$. This is a bounded linear section for the action $(\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B) \hat{\otimes} M \rightarrow M$. Thus covariant representations yield essential modules. Applying this to left and right module structure on $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B$, we see that $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B$ is quasi-unital. Conversely, if M is an essential $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B$ -module, we get a smooth representation of G and an essential B -module structure using the morphisms $\mathcal{D}(G), B \dashrightarrow \mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B$. They satisfy the covariance condition and their integrated form is the given $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B$ -module structure. One checks easily that the above constructions are functorial and inverse to each other. Thus we have an isomorphism of categories. $\square$

7.2. Tempered crossed product algebras. Now let $\mathcal{T}(G)$ be a smooth convolution algebra on G . Let B be as above and suppose, in addition, that the operators W and W^{-1} in (25) extend to bounded linear operators on $\mathcal{T}(G, B) := \mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes} B$. Using this and that $\mathcal{T}(G)$ is a convolution algebra, one can check easily that the convolution (24) extends to a bounded bilinear map on $\mathcal{T}(G, B)$. We let $\mathcal{T}(G) \ltimes B$ be $\mathcal{T}(G, B)$ equipped with this multiplication.

Proposition 57. *The algebra $\mathcal{T}(G) \ltimes B$ is quasi-unital and the embedding*

$$i: \mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(G) \ltimes B$$

is a proper morphism. The category $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}(G) \ltimes B)$ is isomorphic to the category of covariant representations (ρ, π) for which $\pi: G \rightarrow \text{Aut}(M)$ is $\mathcal{T}(G)$ -tempered.

Proof. The same argument as for $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B$ shows that $\mathcal{T}(G) \ltimes B$ is an essential B -bimodule and that the representations of G on $\mathcal{T}(G) \ltimes B$ by left and right multiplication are smooth. Hence $\mathcal{T}(G) \ltimes B$ carries a covariant representation of G and B . By Theorem 56, $\mathcal{T}(G) \ltimes B$ is an essential bimodule over $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B$. Lemma 28 implies that $\mathcal{T}(G) \ltimes B$ is quasi-unital and that the embedding of $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B$ is a proper morphism. Since this homomorphism has dense range, the induced functor $\text{Mod}((\mathcal{T}(G) \ltimes B)^+) \rightarrow \text{Mod}((\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B)^+)$ is fully faithful. Proposition 31 shows that the smoothening functor on $\text{Mod}((\mathcal{T}(G) \ltimes B)^+)$ is the restriction of the smoothening functor on $\text{Mod}((\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B)^+)$. Thus a module over $\mathcal{T}(G) \ltimes B$ is essential if and only if it is essential as a module over $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B$. By Theorem 56, $\text{Mod}(\mathcal{T}(G) \ltimes B)$ is isomorphic to the category of covariant representations (π, ρ) whose integrated form extends to a bounded homomorphism on $\mathcal{T}(G) \ltimes B$. The latter just means that the integrated form of π extends to $\mathcal{T}(G)$. $\square$

Theorem 58. *Let G be a locally compact group and let $\mathcal{T}(G)$ be an isocohomological smooth convolution algebra on G . Let B_1 and B_2 be quasi-unital bornological algebras, equipped with actions of G by automorphisms. Suppose that the operators W and W^{-1} in (25) extend to bounded operators on $\mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes} B_2$, so that $\mathcal{T}(G) \ltimes B_2$ is defined. Let $i: B_1 \dashrightarrow B_2$ be a G -equivariant isocohomological morphism.*

Then the induced morphism $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B_1 \dashrightarrow \mathcal{T}(G) \ltimes B_2$ is isocohomological.

Proof. By Proposition 37, it suffices to prove that the morphisms $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B_1 \dashrightarrow \mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B_2$ and $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B_2 \dashrightarrow \mathcal{T}(G) \ltimes B_2$ are isocohomological.

The morphism $i^B: B \dashrightarrow \mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B$ gives rise to a functor

$$i_!^B: \text{Mod}(B) \rightarrow \text{Mod}(\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B), \quad M \mapsto i_!^B(M) = (\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B) \hat{\otimes}_B M.$$

Since $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B$ is projective as a right B -module, this functor is exact, that is, $i_!^B = \mathbb{L} i_!^B$. Moreover, $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B_2 \cong i_!^{B_1}(B_2) \cong (\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B_1) \hat{\otimes}_{B_1}^{\mathbb{L}} B_2$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B_2 \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B_1}^{\mathbb{L}} \mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B_2 &\cong \mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B_2 \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B_1}^{\mathbb{L}} \mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B_1 \hat{\otimes}_{B_1}^{\mathbb{L}} B_2 \\ &\cong (\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B_2) \hat{\otimes}_{B_1}^{\mathbb{L}} B_2 \cong \mathcal{D}(G) \hat{\otimes} (B_2 \hat{\otimes}_{B_1}^{\mathbb{L}} B_2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B_1 \dashrightarrow \mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B_2$ is isocohomological if and only if $B_1 \dashrightarrow B_2$ is.

Next we let $B = B_2$ and show that $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B \dashrightarrow \mathcal{T}(G) \ltimes B$ is isocohomological. The morphism $i^G: \mathcal{D}(G) \dashrightarrow \mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B$ gives rise to a functor

$$i_!^G: \text{Mod}(G) \rightarrow \text{Mod}(\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B), \quad M \mapsto i_!^G(M) = (\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B) \hat{\otimes}_G M.$$

Since $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B$ is projective as a right $\mathcal{D}(G)$ -module, this functor is exact, that is, $i_!^G = \mathbb{L} i_!^G$. One checks easily that $\mathcal{T}(G) \ltimes B \cong i_!^G \mathcal{T}(G)$, using that W and W^{-1} are bounded on $\mathcal{T}(G) \hat{\otimes} B$. As above, this implies that $\mathcal{D}(G) \ltimes B \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(G) \ltimes B$ is isocohomological if and only if $\mathcal{T}(G)$ is isocohomological. $\square$

7.3. Application to noncommutative tori. In this section, we show how Alain Connes's computations for non-commutative tori in [3] fit into our framework. Our method obviously extends to non-commutative tori of higher rank and to some other crossed product algebras. We do not pursue this here in order to formulate results very concretely. Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ and let $\mathbb{T}_\theta^2$ be the noncommutative 2-torus defined by invertible generators U, V satisfying the relation $UV = \exp(2\pi i \theta) VU$ for some $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. We define bornological algebras

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2) \subseteq \mathcal{S}^\omega(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$$

of polynomial, holomorphic, real analytic, and smooth functions on $\mathbb{T}_\theta^2$. These spaces are equal to $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}^2]$, $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{Z}^2)$, $\mathcal{S}^\omega(\mathbb{Z}^2)$, and $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{Z}^2)$ as bornological vector spaces, and equipped with the product defined by $UV = \exp(2\pi i \theta) VU$. For $\theta = 0$, we get the algebras of Laurent series, of holomorphic functions on $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^2$, of real analytic functions on $\mathbb{T}^2$, and of smooth functions on $\mathbb{T}^2$, respectively. Thus one may also use the notation $\mathcal{P}((\mathbb{C}^\times)_\theta^2)$ and $\mathcal{O}((\mathbb{C}^\times)_\theta^2)$ to stress that these algebras live on the complex torus $(\mathbb{C}^\times)^2$.

Let $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ be one of these bornological algebras. We remark that $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ carries the fine bornology, $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ and $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ are Fréchet-Schwartz spaces equipped with the precompact bornology, and $\mathcal{S}^\omega(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ is a Silva space (see [19]). However, the only property that we need is that $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Z}) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Z}) \cong \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Z}^2)$.

Let $\mathbb{Z}$ act on the convolution algebra $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Z})$ by $n \cdot V^m := \exp(2\pi i \theta \cdot nm) V^m$. This defines a representation of $\mathbb{Z}$ by automorphisms. The operator W in (25) is given by $W(U^m V^n) = \exp(2\pi i \theta \cdot mn) U^m V^n$. This is evidently a bounded linear operator on $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}) = \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Z}) \hat{\otimes} \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Z})$. Hence we can form the crossed product algebra $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Z}) \ltimes \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Z})$. Of course, this is nothing but $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$.

Theorem 59. *The embeddings of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ in $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$, $\mathcal{S}^\omega(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ and $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ are isocohomological.*

Proof. Theorem 42 shows that the embedding $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}] \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Z})$ is isocohomological. Therefore, the embedding $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2) = \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}] \ltimes \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}] \rightarrow \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Z}) \ltimes \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Z}) = \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ is isocohomological by Theorem 58. $\square$

Let $K_\bullet$ be the complex of free $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ -bimodules

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2) \otimes \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2) \xrightarrow{b_2} [\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2) \otimes \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)]^2 \xrightarrow{b_1} \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2) \otimes \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2) \rightarrow 0$$

augmented by a map $K_0 \xrightarrow{b_0} \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$, where

$$b_0(x \otimes y) := x \cdot y,$$

$$b_1(x_1 \otimes y_1, x_2 \otimes y_2) := x_1 \otimes y_1 - x_1 U^{-1} \otimes U y_1 + x_2 \otimes y_2 - x_2 V^{-1} \otimes V y_2,$$

$$b_2(x \otimes y) := (x \otimes y - x V^{-1} \otimes V y, x U^{-1} \otimes U y - x \otimes y).$$

It is easy to check that $K_\bullet \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ is a free $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ -bimodule resolution of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$. This purely algebraic statement is not affected if we equip all spaces in $K_\bullet$ with the fine bornology.

Since $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ is free as a right module, the chain complex above is still contractible as a complex of right modules. Hence $K_\bullet \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)} M \rightarrow M$ is a free resolution of M for any $M \in \mathbf{Mod}(\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2))$. As a result, $\mathbb{R} \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)}(M, N)$ and $M \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)}^{\mathbb{L}} N$ can be identified with the bornological chain complexes

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)}(M, N) &\xrightarrow{b_2} \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)}(M, N)^2 \xrightarrow{b_1} \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)}(M, N) \rightarrow 0 \\ 0 \rightarrow M \hat{\otimes} N &\xrightarrow{b_2} (M \hat{\otimes} N)^2 \xrightarrow{b_1} M \hat{\otimes} N \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 59 implies that the same chain complexes also compute $\mathbb{R} \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)}(M, N)$ and $M \hat{\otimes}_{\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)}^{\mathbb{L}} N$. In particular, $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ has cohomological dimension 2.

The *commutator quotient* $M/\mathfrak{h}$ of a bimodule M is the quotient of M by the closed linear span of elements of the form $am - ma$ with $a \in A$, $m \in M$. The Hochschild homology of a quasi-unital algebra A is equal to the homology of $P_\bullet/\mathfrak{h}$ for any projective bimodule resolution $P_\bullet$ of A because such algebras are H-unital (see [13]). Theorem 35.1 provides such a resolution for $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$. The resulting commutator quotient complex is

$$\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2) \xrightarrow{\delta_2} \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)^2 \xrightarrow{\delta_1} \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$$

with $\delta_2(x) = (x - VxV^{-1}, UxU^{-1} - x)$, $\delta_1(x_1, x_2) = x_1 - Ux_1U^{-1} + x_2 - Vx_2V^{-1}$. We can identify this chain complex with $L \hat{\otimes} L$, where L is the chain complex

$$\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Z}) \xrightarrow{\alpha} \mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Z}), \quad \alpha f(m) := (1 - \exp(2\pi i \theta m))f(m),$$

concentrated in degrees 0 and 1. The kernel of α is spanned by δ_0 if θ is irrational. The restriction of α to $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}^*]$ is invertible. Thus the chain complex L for $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ is homotopy equivalent to $\mathbb{C} \xrightarrow{0} \mathbb{C}$. As a result, the Hochschild homology of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ is given by $\mathbb{C}$, $\mathbb{C}^2$, and $\mathbb{C}$ in dimensions 0, 1, and 2, and vanishes in higher dimensions.

If we replace $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Z}^*]$ by $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{Z}^*)$, the restriction of α need not be invertible any more. The issue is whether or not the function $m \mapsto (1 - \exp(2\pi i \theta m))^{-1}$ on $\mathbb{Z}^*$ has polynomial, subexponential, or exponential growth, depending on whether we consider $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{Z})$, $\mathcal{S}^\omega(\mathbb{Z})$, or $\mathcal{O}(\mathbb{Z})$. It is observed by Alain Connes ([3]) that this question for $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{Z})$ depends on the Diophantine approximation properties of the parameter θ . The same holds for the other function spaces. The Hochschild homologies of $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ and $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ agree if and only if $(1 - \exp(2\pi i \theta m))^{-1}$ satisfies the appropriate growth condition. Otherwise, the Hochschild homology of $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$ contains some additional

infinite dimensional non-Hausdorff spaces in dimensions 1 and 0. We remark that these additions disappear in periodic cyclic homology. The reason is the gauge action of $\mathbb{T}^2$ on $\mathcal{T}(\mathbb{T}_\theta^2)$. By homotopy invariance, only the gauge invariant part of the Hochschild homology contributes to the periodic cyclic homology.

REFERENCES

- [1] Marcel Bökstedt and Amnon Neeman, *Homotopy limits in triangulated categories*, Compositio Math. **86** (1993), 209–234. MR1214458 (94f:18008)
- [2] Martin R. Bridson and André Haefliger, *Metric spaces of non-positive curvature*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999, ISBN 3-540-64324-9. MR1744486 (2000k:53038)
- [3] Alain Connes, *Noncommutative differential geometry*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1985), 257–360. MR823176 (87i:58162)
- [4] James W. Cannon, David B. A. Epstein, Derek F. Holt, Silvio V. F. Levy, Michael S. Paterson, and William P. Thurston, *Word processing in groups*, Jones and Bartlett Publishers, Boston, MA, 1992, ISBN 0-86720-244-0. MR1161694 (93i:20036)
- [5] Mikhael Gromov, *Groups of polynomial growth and expanding maps*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1981), 53–73. MR623534 (83b:53041)
- [6] Alexandre Grothendieck, *Produits tensoriels topologiques et espaces nucléaires*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc., vol. 16, 1955. MR0075539 (17,763c) (French)
- [7] Philip Hall, *The Edmonton notes on nilpotent groups*, Queen Mary College Mathematics Notes, Mathematics Department, Queen Mary College, London, 1969. MR0283083 (44 #316)
- [8] Henri Hogbe-Nlend, *Complétion, tenseurs et nucléarité en bornologie*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **49** (1970), 193–288. MR0279557 (43 #5279) (French)
- [9] ———, *Bornologies and functional analysis*, North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam, 1977, ISBN 0-7204-0712-5. MR0500064 (58 #17774)
- [10] Paul Jolissaint, *Rapidly decreasing functions in reduced C^* -algebras of groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **317** (1990), 167–196. MR943303 (90d:22006)
- [11] Bernhard Keller, *Chain complexes and stable categories*, Manuscripta Math. **67** (1990), 379–417. MR1052551 (91h:18006)
- [12] ———, *Derived categories and their uses*, Handbook of Algebra, Vol. 1, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1996, pp. 671–701. MR1421815 (98h:18013)
- [13] Jean-Louis Loday, *Cyclic homology*, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1998, ISBN 3-540-63074-0. MR1600246 (98h:16014)
- [14] A. I. Malcev, *On a class of homogeneous spaces*, Amer. Math. Soc. Translation **1951** (1951), 33. MR0039734 (12,589e)
- [15] A. I. Malcev, *On a class of homogeneous spaces*, Izvestiya Akad. Nauk. SSSR. Ser. Mat. **13** (1949), 9–32. MR0028842 (10,507d) (Russian)
- [16] Ralf Meyer, *Bornological versus topological analysis in metrizable spaces*, Banach Algebras and Their Applications (Anthony To-Ming Lau Volker Runde, eds.), Contemporary Mathematics, vol. 363, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004, pp. 249–278.
- [17] ———, *Smooth group representations on bornological vector spaces*, Bull. Sci. Math. **128** (2004), 127–166. MR2039113 (English, with English and French summaries)
- [18] ———, *On a representation of the idele class group related to primes and zeros of L -functions*, Duke Math. J. (to appear).
- [19] ———, *Combable groups have group cohomology of polynomial growth* (2004), arXiv:math.KT/0410597 (eprint).
- [20] Ralf Meyer and Ryszard Nest, *The Baum-Connes conjecture via localization of categories* (2004), arXiv:math.KT/0312292 v2 (eprint).
- [21] G. D. Mostow, *Strong rigidity of locally symmetric spaces*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1973, Annals of Mathematics Studies, No. 78. MR0385004 (52 #5874)
- [22] Amnon Neeman, *The derived category of an exact category*, J. Algebra **135** (1990), 388–394. MR1080854 (91m:18016)
- [23] ———, *Triangulated categories*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, vol. 148, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2001, ISBN 0-691-08685-0, 0-691-08686-9. MR1812507 (2001k:18010)
- [24] Fabienne Prosmans, *Algèbre homologique quasi-Abélienne*, Thesis, Université Paris-Nord, 1995. (French)
- [25] ———, *Derived categories for functional analysis*, Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **36** (2000), 19–83. MR1749013 (2001g:46156)
- [26] Fabienne Prosmans and Jean-Pierre Schneiders, *A Homological Study of Bornological Spaces* (2000), Université Paris 13 Preprint.

- [27] Jean-Pierre Schneiders, *Quasi-abelian categories and sheaves*, Mém. Soc. Math. Fr. (N.S.) (1999), vi+134. MR1779315 (2001i:18023) (English, with English and French summaries)
- [28] Jean-Louis Verdier, *Des catégories dérivées des catégories abéliennes*, Astérisque (1996), xii+253 pp. (1997). MR1453167 (98c:18007) (French, with French summary)

MATHEMATISCHES INSTITUT, WESTFÄLISCHE WILHELMS-UNIVERSITÄT MÜNSTER, EINSTEIN-STR. 62, 48149 MÜNSTER, GERMANY
E-mail address: `rameyer@math.uni-muenster.de`